

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Nejdat Mulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Pal Shiu Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:
H. R. 1743. A bill for the relief of George C. Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1744. A bill for the relief of John C. K. Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:
H. R. 1746. A bill for the relief of Rosa Gelassen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:
H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Utica Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1748. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Krause Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Muller Tournay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Elena Gigliotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Research in Blinding Eye Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because those disease of the eyes which result in blindness have been brought close to home to me, my interest in the research programs being carried on has certainly increased.

Recently a group of doctors conducting research in retrolental fibroplasia, an eye disease which has affected 50 percent of those premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth, discovered a practical prevention of almost all of this disease. There is no doubt that this discovery is far more important to the people of our country than any other medical discovery; as this might well pave the way for the eventual cure of the majority of our eye diseases.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a short statement with reference to this discovery.

Today, we are spending less than \$2 million for medical research in the blinding eye diseases—a group of conditions which more than any other group stakes a claim on the American taxpayer—for the education, training, and support of the blind. What we are spending for research today is just a little more than we have been spending for the past decade—in spite of the overwhelming evidence that such research can either prevent or cure disorders of the eye.

Last year and, indeed, the year before, I asked that the appropriations of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness be increased with a view toward strengthening the weak national research programs in both the neurological and sensory disorders. As you know, those increases were given, so that now the budget of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness stands at \$7,600,000 and the number of investigations on blinding eye disorders conducted throughout the United States has burgeoned by 25 to 30 percent.

This research attack is still pitifully small, but to the citizens of this country, Congress' action on the Institute's appropriations may well be a source of deep gratitude. In the short span of 2

years, rapid progress has been made against eye disease; modes of prevention and treatment have been developed with the results that thousands now are escaping the helpless fate of darkened vision and the economic burden of their care, which is the country's responsibility, has been lightened.

Let me illustrate just one of the many achievements made under the eye research programs of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. This achievement represents the virtual conquest of retrolental fibroplasia, a blinding eye disease which affected 50 percent of those premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth. Retrolental fibroplasia may be an unfamiliar disease to you, but for 5,000 mothers in this country whose children have completely lost their sight because of this condition its name spells constant despair. It is the leading cause of blindness in children; and each of the 5,000 children individually costs the community, State, and Federal governments more than does a single victim of any other disease—\$100,000 for education, training, and support from birth to death, or for all, a grand total of \$500 million.

This past month, however, the practical prevention of almost all retrolental fibroplasia became a dramatic reality. On September 14, Dr. V. Everett Kinsey of the Kresge Eye Institute in Detroit, summed up the results of a 1-year study of retrolental fibroplasia before a large gathering of eye specialists from all over the United States and from all over the continent as well. What he had to say was simple—the major contributing cause of the disease was oxygen, the oxygen which was routinely administered to premature children in hospital incubators. The way to stop retrolental fibroplasia was to stop using oxygen, except where urgently needed in crisis.

Dr. Kinsey, I should point out, was speaking on behalf of more than 75 pediatricians and ophthalmologists who during the past year have worked in close coordination in 18 hospitals throughout the United States to come up with the answer. The answer was made possible by the Government through support of the study by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. The answer—oxygen—perhaps sounds simple to you, yet it represented the end of what had been a long, hard 12-year hunt for the cause of the disease on the part of hundreds of scientists.

Their quest may prove as interesting to you as it is for me. Retrolental fibroplasia, I should tell you, was first described in the United States in 1942 by a Dr. T. L. Terry. Dr. Terry, himself, tried to explain why the blood-carrying tissues of the eyes were affected in retrolental fibroplasia. He thought the condition was due to factors affecting the mother during pregnancy—possibly toxemia or hemorrhage. Many others believed as Terry did, though they could not find sufficient evidence to support their beliefs.

Retrolental fibroplasia mysteriously continued to grow in incidence from 1942 on, and it began to appear as well in England, on the Continent and elsewhere. More and more it became evident that the disease was probably not related to the condition of the mother during pregnancy but to the changing care of infants in hospitals. Many causes for the disorder were suggested—nutritional deficiencies in the infant or, again, nutritional excesses; irritation of light on the infants' eyes or possibly not sufficient light; mother's milk was first implicated, then cow's milk. As one set of facts were established to support a given theory, another set arose to contradict them. None of them were statistically sound.

By 1951, oxygen had also been suggested as the cause of retrolental fibroplasia—too little oxygen, however, not too much. At the same time, one hospital had noted that the incidence of retrolental fibroplasia seemed to parallel the increasing introduction and use of oxygen-bearing incubators in their maternity wards. But the real possibility that oxygen was the contributing cause could not be substantiated elsewhere.

In 1953 the first real breakthrough came. Dr. Arnall Patz, of Georgetown University, working with newborn rats, proved that constant oxygen administration, such as was routinely given to premature infants in our hospitals, could cause retrolental fibroplasia. Dr. Patz' work was supported by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Whether what was true for animals would prove true for humans remained to be proved. A clinical study of premature infants weighing 3½ pounds or less at birth posed a major problem. Such a study, if conducted at a single hospital, might take 3, 4, or even 5 years before enough premature infants were born so that results of the study would

be statistically valid. If the vital answer were to be obtained as rapidly as possible—and with children blinded each day by retrolental fibroplasia, speed was essential—then a number of hospitals working on the same problem at the same time under the same strict scientific rules of evidence would be needed.

Such a study as this would require considerable funds. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness with its increased appropriations could now make most of the funds available. Just as important, to muster the combined research strength of a large number of distinguished investigators would require organizational capacity of a high order. Through its grantees, however, the Institute had access to some of the leading scientists in the country who might participate in the investigation. With the creation of a subcommittee composed of some of those scientists who worked closely with the Institute, so was born one of the broadest research studies on a single medical problem ever conceived.

The results of this study you now know. That study, you should know, cost the Government just \$40,000. To this sum was added another \$11,000 by the National Foundation for Eye Research and the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness. It appears that the cause of blindness for 5,000 babies has been prevented at a cost of \$51,000—\$10.50 per baby blinded from this cause in this country. The cost of care for 5,000 blind babies will be, for our generation, 100,000 times the cost of the prevention for the future. It appears that we have also removed one more source of pain and misery from the world.

The scientific attack on disease is not always so productive so rapidly. Yet there can be no question that the more effort science can devote to medical problems, the more successful science can be. Let science, through us, in short, attack the dreadful problems of glaucoma, cataract, and diabetic retinopathy on the scale these problems deserve and we count on their answers too—sooner rather than later.

Moro Province Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced in the House today the bill which is commonly known as the Moro Province bill.

This bill is designed to provide long-delayed justice to a small group of less than 500 war veterans and to less than 300 of their dependent widows and children.

The 500 veterans who will benefit from this legislation fought valiantly and nobly 50 years ago in the Moro Provinces and in the islands of Samar and Leyte

in the Philippines. They have been deprived of pensions all of these years due to a minor technicality. The injustice done them can be corrected only by an act of Congress. To correct that injustice is the purpose of my Moro Province bill.

That the members of the Veterans' Committee, who have studied this bill closely and know most about the case, believe an injustice has been done and should be corrected is indicated by the fact that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee four times has approved unanimously bills to provide pensions to the Moro Province veterans.

In the 78th and 79th Democratic Congresses, the Veterans' Committee unanimously reported a Moro Province bill similar to the one which I introduced today.

In the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses, the Veterans' Committee, like the ones in previous Democratic-controlled Congresses, unanimously reported favorably bills similar to the Moro Province bill I have introduced.

In the 78th Congress, the Moro Province bill was passed by both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by President Roosevelt. In the 79th Congress, the House again passed this bill, but it died for lack of action in the Senate.

In the 80th and 83d Congresses, the Veterans' Committee again unanimously approved a Moro Province bill. The Rules Committee, however, held up these bills, and they never were reported for House action.

The cost of the Moro Province bill for its first year was estimated at about \$700,000. This figure will decrease rapidly after the first year since the Moro veterans are of an average age of 78 years.

The case for the Moro Province bill is this:

Technically and legally, the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection ended on July 4, 1902, when the President issued a proclamation of peace. Actually, however, the fighting did not stop. It continued for several years in the Moro Provinces and on Leyte and Samar. American soldiers fought there. A total of 1,548 casualties and deaths from disease occurred. Soldiers engaged in this fighting received 13 Congressional Medals of Honor.

Despite the severity of the fighting and the many casualties these veterans never have been recognized as wartime fighters and have been denied veteran pension rights. Half a century has elapsed since the hostilities. The Moro Province bill which I introduced today would merely provide delayed justice to the handful of Moro veterans who are still alive. The cost is very small.

These veterans have been denied war status and pensions because officially the war had, by proclamation, been terminated. Recently, soldiers in Korea have been granted war and pension rights even for services rendered after the fighting had stopped. Here in the Moro Province and on Samar and Leyte, where the fighting continued after the proclamation of peace, veterans are denied pensions.

Obviously, justice to these Moro Province war veterans has been overlooked. This injustice should be corrected even if Congress is 50 years late in doing so.

I hope that the House Veterans' Committee will report my Moro Province bill favorably and that the Rules Committee will permit it to come to a vote. I am sure that if it is permitted to come to a vote the Moro Province bill will, as it did in two previous sessions, be approved unanimously or almost unanimously.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS INTRODUCES H. R. 1, PROVIDING FOR A 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO ENTER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Chairman JERE COOPER, Committee on Ways and Means, today introduced H. R. 1, which would extend for 3 years the President's authority to enter trade agreements. The bill is patterned along the lines of the President's recommendations to the last Congress on foreign economic policy of the United States, which were based on the findings and recommendations of the Randall Commission.

In addition to the 3-year extension, H. R. 1 would authorize the President to reduce duties in three alternative ways: (1) 15 percent below the July 1, 1955, rates by reductions of not more than 5 percent in each of the 3 years under the extension; or (2) to 50 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1945, in the cases of items which are not being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities; or (3) to 50 percent ad valorem, in the case of any rates now in excess of 50 percent ad valorem.

As under the first alternative, the reductions under the other alternatives would be gradual with no reduction becoming effective until the previous one had been in effect for a year. In the case of the first alternative authority, no decrease could be made effective after June 30, 1958.

The bill would also require the President to report annually on the trade-agreements program, and would authorize the President to reduce duties by 50 percent below the January 1, 1945, rate unilaterally in the case of products which are not being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities.

Mr. COOPER stated:

"Our trade-agreements program is now at the crossroads. Through such programs as economic aid, technical assistance, and our efforts to bolster production in the free nations of the world, we have helped reestablish their war-torn economies. These nations are now in a position where they can and are willing to stand on their own feet. We must try to, on our part, help lay the foundations on which a stable foreign trade can be built. If we do not permit the free nations to trade with us, they will be forced to trade elsewhere, and in many cases this can only mean Russia and her satellites.

"Our reciprocal trade-agreements program occupies a prominent place in our overall

foreign policy, and it is essential that we reaffirm at this time our determination to continue and to liberalize this program in the interest of constructive and cooperative international effort and relations. The foreign policy of the United States depends to a great extent upon the cooperation of strong and healthy free nations. Our tariff and trade policies are especially significant because of our outstanding position of leadership and economic importance. We must help the free nations in every way possible to find the means with which to earn dollars by which to buy our exports. Otherwise their shortages of dollars will force them to restrict imports from us, and this will result in a further loss of our export markets which will mean less wages to labor, profits to businesses and farmers, and taxes to our Government.

"The main way in which we can help provide dollars to the free nations with which to buy our goods is to buy imports from them. With world conditions being what they are today, none of the free nations can afford to become either economically, politically, or militarily isolated from the others. One of the best known tenets of communism is that the way to divide and conquer the free nations of the world is through trade wars. Russia and the countries which she dominates are making an all-out effort to encourage the free nations to trade with them.

"A realistic foreign trade policy on our part will contribute to an expanding world economy, establish and maintain in all the free countries rising levels of employment and real income and create economic conditions which are conducive to world peace. We must strive, in making our decisions on foreign-trade policy, to base them to the maximum extent possible on our national interests. Such a policy will benefit all segments of our economy—agricultural, labor, and industrial alike.

"In my opinion, H. R. 1 is a modest though realistic step in the direction of an expanded market for our exports, while at the same time permitting free nations to earn their own way by increasing their exports to us. I do not now, nor have I ever, advocated the surrendering of our markets to foreign goods; however, I do feel that we can—through enactment of H. R. 1—greatly strengthen the economies of the free world as well as our own, while at the same time still providing realistic protection for our own industries and agriculture.

"A realistic and constructive foreign-trade policy on the part of all the free nations of the world is more important today than it has ever been in the past. If we fail on our part to do our share to bring about such a foreign-trade policy, the other free nations of the world will despair in their cooperative efforts with us to fight communistic aggression and subversion. Our position of leadership in the world today demands that we be a moving factor in expanding world trade."

Four-Year Tenure for Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the election of Members of the House of Representatives for a 4-year tenure.

The 2-year term provided for Members of the House of Representatives written into the Constitution in 1787, in the days of limited communication, was designed to keep the Members in close touch with their constituents. The authors of the Constitution, who wanted the Government to be controlled by the people, also felt that such control would be more effective if all Members of the House of Representatives were compelled to stand for reelection every 2 years.

They feared that a long term in this important body of the Congress might cause the Members to disregard the will of the people to a greater degree, and become more dictatorial as a legislative body.

With the rapid development of travel by train, on paved highways, and by air, and with the rapid development of communications through the press, the mails, and the radio, the people are so well advised on legislative matters as to make biannual elections of the Members of the House of Representatives unnecessary in the future.

In fact, the authors of the Constitution when this subject was under discussion said that the frequency of elections of the Members of the House of Representatives must depend upon a variety of circumstances, and that experience should be the guide to follow.

Through experience we now know that the Senate with 6-year terms has worked well; that the Senators, due to rapid communications, are in close touch with their constituents, as are Members of the House. Modern communications now enable the Members of the House and Senate to preserve the close tie between legislator and constituents that the framers of our Constitution thought was necessary.

The 2-year term for Members of the House has become antiquated. Too frequent elections of Members of the House of Representatives with our increased population, business growth, and the complexity of problems coming to the Congress for solution has reached the point where the biennial election of Members of the House places an unnecessary burden upon such Members, and is a deterrent to better and more efficient governmental service in such capacity.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of the House are given a 4-year tenure, a much greater amount of their time can be employed in the study of legislation and the investigation of governmental problems. If a 4-year term of office is provided, a Member of the House, when elected, will have at least 3 years in which he can give all of his attention to the problems of government before he has to give a part of his time to the consideration of his reelection.

If the Members of the House are provided a 4-year tenure, it will give them greater resistance against the powerful pressure groups that have developed in our politics, which seek to influence the voting of the Members of the House by their power of numbers rather than by the merit of the proposed legislation they are supporting. It will place the Members of the House in a position where they can courageously support and pass legislation which they know to be

in the interest of the Nation, and in which they know such legislation will have time to demonstrate its value in the public interest, and become acceptable to the majority of the people before they have to stand for reelection again.

For instance, Members of the House who voted for the Taft-Hartley law were marked for defeat by the big labor leaders who falsely branded the legislation as a "slave-labor law," and many Members had great difficulty and some failed at election because the law had not had time to become sufficiently understood by the rank and file of labor. This is only one instance in many which points out the necessity of giving the Members of the House a 4-year tenure, and the benefits it will bring to the people in better government.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides that the 4-year tenure will become effective on the year we elect a President. The people elect a President for a 4-year term. If this resolution becomes law, they will elect all of the Members of the House at the time they elect the President. Generally, under our two-party system of government, if the people lose faith in an administration, they put the other party in power, seeking to hold it responsible for the ensuing 4 years.

If a Republican President is elected, he has a right, and the people generally want him, to have a majority of his own party, so that they may hold that party responsible. If a Democrat President is elected, they want him to have a majority so that they can hold that party responsible. This is one of the great advantages of the two-party system, and if this resolution is adopted, it will strengthen the two-party system for the future, which will be of untold benefit in the future to our processes of government, as it has been in the past.

We cannot hold a party responsible, we cannot achieve the best in government for the people with the President of one party, and the legislative branch controlled by the opposite party.

In closing, may I say that there is utterly no sense, rhyme or reason for the continuance of the election of the Members of the House for a 2-year term. The time and expense of election is a burden that prevents more able men from being willing to enter public service. It is a deterrent to good progressive government, is antiquated, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will take the great and progressive step toward better government that a 4-year tenure for Members of the House of Representatives would assure.

Wanted: A 49th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers who founded

this Republic fought a costly and bloody war to free themselves from the tyranny of taxation without representation. Yet we, their descendants, today, impose taxation without representation upon the 523,000 inhabitants of Hawaii.

Hawaiian youths are drafted to serve in the Armed Forces of our country. The Hawaiian people must pay the same tax rates as those levied upon the citizens of our 48 States. The Hawaiians must abide by our laws. But Hawaiians have no vote in the making of draft laws, in the fixing of tax schedules or in enacting any law.

This obviously is unfair and not in keeping with America's historic traditions. The situation should be speedily remedied by the enactment early in this new session of Congress of a law that will make Hawaii the 49th State.

The people of Hawaii, during the past year, paid a greater amount of taxes into the Federal Treasury than did the citizens of 11 of our present States; these being Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Hawaii, today, has a greater population than four of our States; these being Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Some say Hawaii is too remote from the Capitol in Washington, but she is closer to it, in travel time, than was Nebraska or Kansas at the time of their admission to the Union.

Congress should act quickly to right an old injustice by voting statehood to Hawaii soon so that her people may exercise the American right of voting for citizens to represent them in the Congress and for others to be President and Vice President of the Republic.

Haym Salomon Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would authorize and direct the President to proclaim January 6 of each year as Haym Salomon Day.

Haym Salomon is possibly the least known patriot of the American Revolution. Today is the anniversary of the death of this great Jewish-American who helped to bring this country into being.

He came to this country from Poland, settled in New York, and there engaged in business. He became active in the Sons of Liberty which was organized in the colonies for the purpose of breaking away from Britain and setting up an independent country, which subsequently was set up as the United States of America. In 1776 he was arrested by the British and confined to jail. He was released a year later and immediately reengaged actively in the effort to set up this country as a free and independent nation.

He was arrested again in 1778, court-martialed for spying and sentenced to be hanged. With the aid of his fellow patriots, he escaped to Philadelphia, where he continued his activities on behalf of the cause of liberty and freedom.

When the efforts of the Founding Fathers were at their lowest ebb, when their leaders did not know where to turn, Haym Salomon came to the front and contributed his entire fortune to finance the continuance of the Revolutionary War.

He gave to the cause \$640,000, his entire wealth. While it is a small sum, as we look at money today, it was a tremendous sum in those days. In addition to that, he went out and pledged his personal credit and borrowed additional sums.

General Washington and others of that day have given him credit for having financed the successful continuation of that war, as a result of which our fine Nation came into being and has since grown into a great and prosperous country. Neither his estate nor his descendants were repaid the loans he made to our Government nor those guaranteed by him. Haym Salomon died penniless.

I think that we could do little less than honor his memory by asking or authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim each year January 6 as Haym Salomon Day in commemoration of that great American patriot, not by making it a national holiday but by proclaiming it as a day of commemoration and directing that the United States flag be flown on all Government buildings on that day.

The Program of the United States Information Service in Italy, Spain, Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, With Specific Information Concerning Rome, Naples, Palermo, Madrid, Barcelona, Algiers, Casablanca, and Tunis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an outline of the program of the United States Information Service in Italy, Spain, Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, with specific information concerning Rome, Naples, Palermo, Madrid, Barcelona, Algiers, Casablanca, and Tunis:

ITALY

In Italy the job of the United States Information Service—USIS—is to win Italian support for the development of free world strength and to help expose and defeat the Communist conspiracy. We are trying to show the Italian people that the policies of the United States are based on interests compatible with Italy's own legitimate aspirations, and wherever possible we are trying to stimulate the Italians to a more vigorous defense of

their own democracy. In Italy all the media of the agency are employed in accomplishing our objectives, namely, radio, press, motion pictures, libraries, and exhibits.

USIS Rome, where Ned Nordness is public affairs officer and John MacKnight his deputy, has, with the Italy branch offices, been concentrating in recent months on a special cultural program to counter the still widely held concept among Italians of United States immaturity and cultural barrenness. USIS officers, through cultivation of key personalities in Italian education, have been instrumental in the establishment of, or in initiating procedures for establishing, chairs in American studies at 4 major Italian universities—1 in Venice, 2 in Florence, 1 in Rome—thus placing American studies for the first time on an equal footing with other academic subjects in the Italian university curriculum. The Atoms for Peace Exhibit, which opened in Rome last June and by now has toured some 20 other Italian cities, has been a tremendous success in stimulating Italian awareness of the President's atoms for peace program and of the United States commitment to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Walter Wien is public affairs officer in Naples, a post that is especially important not only as the center of NATO naval effort but as one of the principal cities, along with Palermo, of a vast economically backward and previously isolated area which offers the greatest danger today for Communist growth. Here an economic development and reform program, set in motion by democratic Italian governments since the war, is producing a slow awakening which the Communist Party is attempting to exploit to its own advantage.

Paul Wheeler is acting public affairs officer in Palermo, a post that is faced with special problems in serving an isolated, in many ways still backward, island community.

SPAIN

In Spain, Morrill Cody is public affairs officer in Madrid, and William Hart is public affairs officer in Barcelona. Our USIS program there has made increasingly active and effective use of all media—radio, press, films, exhibits, and our library centers. We are concentrating in Spain on helping to insure the success of the United States aid agreements with that country by bringing about a clear understanding of their purposes. We are trying also to convince the Spaniards of the importance of the Western European Community and the value of international cooperation and collective military strength. The Madrid office is increasing its efforts in areas of defense activity and is giving special support to the United States military program for establishing good troop-community relations.

In Barcelona, which is the center of the rapidly developing industrial area of Catalonia, a special effort is being made, under the educational exchange program, to increase the number of leader and specialist grants to Catalonian industrialists in order to give those who

will have a hand in developing the area a broader point of view.

ALGERIA

The strategic importance of Algeria, together with Tunisia and Morocco, in western defense and its vital contribution to the economic health of France are among the reasons for a USIS program in this country. Communist propaganda strives constantly to deepen the differences between the French and the Arab population on the "colonial issue" and to create suspicion and hatred of the United States.

Mr. John Rhodes is public affairs officer in Algiers. The United States Information Service works through an information center, press and publications, and radio to expose Communist motives and strengthen confidence in the United States. The past year has featured a successful effort to extend the influence of the program into a growing number of population centers throughout Algeria.

TUNIS

Although the political situation in Tunisia is restrictive, as in Morocco, the atmosphere of conciliation permits association with many Arab groups. The fact that the public affairs officer is fluent in Arabic, and well as French, and had established association with the Arab population prior to the period of violence, further increases the program opportunities.

Mr. Leslie Lewis is public affairs officer at Tunis. Through the use of the four media—press, radio, films, and the library—the USIS operation in Tunis explains and exploits American foreign policy with regard to Tunisia in particular, founded on the Byroade statement regarding American foreign policy in colonial areas. This is directed at the mixed middle-group audience of politically conscious French-Tunisians, Arab-Tunisians, and minority groups—Italians, Jews, Corsicans, Maltese, and so forth. The program is not directed to the political extremists, which are an unlikely audience because of the exclusiveness of their interests.

MOROCCO

The USIS American staff in Morocco consists of a country public affairs officer, Mr. James Carter, and two subordinate public affairs officers, Mr. Donald R. Norland, at Rabat, and Miss Annadele Riley, stationed at Casablanca. The activities at Casablanca are conducted by Miss Riley, under the supervision of Mr. Carter, who visits Casablanca frequently.

In addition to this American complement, which is assigned to carry forward the aims of the United States Information Agency among the Moroccan population, the International Broadcasting Service—IBS—of the Agency, known as the Voice of America, maintains a relay station at Tangier which transmits short-wave programs to Europe and Iron Curtain countries. No programs are broadcast to Morocco, this being technically impossible because the short-wave radio beam rides over the area adjacent to the transmitters.

The present political situation in Morocco, and resulting restrictions imposed on the Information Service by the

local French administration, severely limits the scope of the USIS activities there. There is virtually no possibility of personal association with the Moroccan population. The realities of the local situation permit factual news reporting by press, radio, and films and the publicizing of American cultural activities through the Information Center. These programs contribute to United States objectives by displaying the United States in a favorable light, and through its subject matter tends to enlist the cooperation of the French and Moroccans.

My experience with the United States Information Agency is that insufficient appropriations have been allotted to this Agency. This is an agency which is involved in the battle of men's minds, and ideas are more important than bullets. We appropriated \$77,114,000 for propaganda purposes, which included funds for the Voice of America and the United States Information Agency. Against this figure, it is interesting to note that the Soviet Union spends about one and one-third billion dollars on propaganda. In comparison, our expenditure is minuscular.

In my contact with the United States Information Service, I wish to state that I have found the staff both here and abroad to be made up of hardworking, painstaking, and patriotic public servants.

The President, significantly, in today's state of the Union message urged enhancement of our USIA information facilities.

Impact on Veterans' Benefits of Presidential Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of the President terminating certain benefits now available to veterans of the Korean conflict was issued last Saturday—January 1, 1955. Its effective date is January 31. One of the results of this proclamation is to bar accumulation of eligibility for education or training under Public Law 550, after this cutoff date. I have introduced legislation which will permit all those members of the armed services on January 31, 1955, to gain the full education benefits if they serve for as much as 2 years after that date. Many recruiting offices have promised the full benefits of the GI bill of rights to those men now serving and unless legislation such as my bill is enacted, the Government will not make good on its promises. I am sure that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give this subject early action.

I am indicating below some of the results flowing from the proclamation:

Basic service period: Korean service, by the terms of the proclamation, has been officially set as on or after June 27, 1950, and through January 31, 1955.

Education and training: Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress authorizes 1½ days of education or training for each day of service performed during this basic service period with a maximum of 36 calendar months of entitlement. The proclamation means that no additional eligibility may be accumulated under this law after January 31, 1955, and persons first entering service after such date acquire no eligibility for the benefits. The proclamation also ends eligibility for training under the vocational rehabilitation laws.

Compensation: Today disabled veterans of the Korean conflict are entitled to service-connected disability compensation ranging from \$17 per month for a 10-percent disability to \$181 per month for total disability. In certain severely disabled cases special rates may go as high as \$420 per month. Any veteran who has a service-connected disability as a result of service after January 31, 1955, will be entitled, as a peacetime veteran, to 80 percent of the rates mentioned previously. Certain presumptions of service connection in chronic disease cases will not be available to veterans separated from service after January 31, 1955. After that date eligibility for service-connected death compensation will also be on a peacetime basis, with rates based on 80 percent of the wartime rate.

Pensions: Veterans of World War I, II, and Korea today are entitled under certain conditions to non-service-connected disability pension at rates of \$66.16, \$78.75, or \$135.45, depending upon age, condition, and other factors. Service after the date of January 31, 1955, will be considered peacetime, but any veterans serving, for example, as little as 1 day prior to the delimiting date and 89 additional days continuously thereafter will be eligible for non-service-connected disability pension under the existing laws.

Widows and children of veterans of the Korean conflict period—June 27, 1950, through January 31, 1955—are eligible for pension based upon the non-service-connected death of such veterans. The basic rate for a widow is \$50.40 per month. This program will not be available to dependents of persons first entering the service on or after February 1, 1955.

Automobiles: Veterans of exclusive service after January 31, 1955, will not be eligible for the benefits of Public Law 187, 82d Congress, which provides \$1,600 toward the purchase of a specially equipped automobile for service-connected veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, or feet, or who are blind as defined.

Hospitalization: No entitlement to VA hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities where the service of the veteran is solely after January 31, 1955.

Insurance: The proclamation does not affect in any way provisions of Public Law 23 which automatically insures any serviceman in the amount of \$10,000 while in active service. It is payable over a 10-year period to beneficiaries defined in the law.

Housing: The issuance of the proclamation means that in order for a veteran to obtain a loan guaranty—maximum \$7,500—the loan must be made prior to February 1, 1965. So long as there is service prior to January 31, 1955, additional service to complete the required 90 days may be had after that date, if continuous.

Mustering-out payments: Mustering-out payments in the amount of \$100, \$200, or \$300, depending upon the length and place of service will no longer be available to veterans who serve exclusively after January 31, 1955.

Public housing preference: Those serving exclusively after January 31, 1955, will no longer enjoy preference in the occupancy of low-rent public housing. They also will not have the benefits of certain provisions of the National Housing Act and certain assistance in the acquisition of family-size farm under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Unemployment compensation: Public Law 550, 82d Congress, makes veterans serving on or after June 27, 1950, eligible for unemployment compensation of \$26 per week not to exceed 26 weeks. This program is administered by the States. The proclamation ends this right as of January 31, 1955, for those serving exclusively after that date.

Income tax: Enlisted men serving in combat zone defined in Executive Order 10195, December 20, 1950, did not have to pay taxes on their pay. Executive order issued in conjunction with proclamation terminates this tax exemption.

Legislation To Make Tax Free the Gain on the Sale of a Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I dropped a bill in the hopper to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence.

The purpose of this bill is to rectify a longstanding situation which now places an unfair financial burden on the parents of our Nation, when they find it necessary to dispose of a large home after the children have grown and married and have families of their own.

Most young married couples rent an apartment at first. Then, when they have children, they buy a modest home. As more children come along and grow up, it is necessary to purchase a larger home which becomes the scene of many happy hours which include birthday parties and holiday festivities as well as courtships and weddings. When the father and mother have completed the lifelong task of rearing their children and the days of the past are fond memories, they desire to move to a smaller

home or an apartment to enjoy the peace and rest that is due them.

This is when the Government steps in to levy a huge tax bill on the total profit realized by the sale of the former homes. This is penalizing the parents who brought into this world our future citizens who will play an important part in the progress and growth of our Nation.

This situation should be changed and it is my hope that the Congress will enact proper legislation to alleviate the hardship resulting from the present law.

The Fight Against Illegal Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is one battle in the cold war of today which is in critical need of attention by this House. I am speaking of our country's continuing fight against the vicious and deadly traffic in illegal narcotics, a traffic which has apparently become one of the major weapons of the international Communist conspiracy throughout the world.

Although our small Government forces in this specialized field are fighting valiantly and tirelessly, the battle is not being won. On the contrary, as recently as June 1 of 1954, the United Nations Bulletin reported:

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs noted that there was a high level of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs which seemed to be increasing.

The Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, United States representative on this Commission, has issued several reports in recent months which paint an alarming picture of the extent and danger of this illicit traffic, which is worldwide in its scope and devastating in its effects upon the health and morale of its victims.

Yet, in the face of abundant evidence that the danger is mounting throughout the world, the 83d Congress was responsible for further cuts in the already slender manpower of the United States customs inspection force, the Border Patrol, and other agencies having some responsibility in this vital field of law enforcement and protection of our Nation.

The same Congress, I regret to say, failed to take any action on the numerous bills before it which called for a strengthening of existing penalties for narcotics violations, especially in the field of second and third offenses.

If this new Congress does nothing else in the field of law enforcement, we owe it to our children to restore at the earliest possible date a fully effective customs inspection and border patrol force, as our coastal line of defense against illegal importation of narcotics. We should also act immediately to strengthen the penal provisions of our narcotics laws, particularly for criminal repeaters who destroy the very

souls of American manhood and womanhood through their evil traffic.

I believe we also have an obligation to our Armed Forces and civil servants in occupied areas, as well as to humanity in general, to investigate to the fullest extent the organized and depraved conspiracy of international communism in its effort to subvert free people through promotion of narcotics addiction.

Continuing and complete exposure of this evil practice, with the documentation and human evidence available to us, will not only serve as a true and effective answer to the false propaganda of germ warfare still being circulated by Moscow and Peiping, but will also point the way to more efficient counter-measures by the free world.

To these ends, I have offered a House resolution authorizing a full and complete investigation of illegal narcotic traffic as an instrument and weapon of the international Communist conspiracy, and have also reintroduced the bill which I sponsored as H. R. 4453 in the 83d Congress, which would increase the penalty provisions of certain acts dealing with narcotics.

At the proper time, I trust that many Members will join with me in sponsorship of whatever amendments are necessary to restore our first-line fighting strength in the battle to stop illegal narcotic traffic in our ports and along our borders.

The cost of these measures will be small. The cost of our failure to take them—in terms of increased crime and broken lives—could be too great to reckon.

Fireman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to do honor to those who devote their lives to the service of others. Men and women who find happiness in doing what they can to make life a bit easier for others and to bring encouragement and faith to the stricken are great people, the kind of people who make our country great. Such spirit of service is common among the members of our police and fire departments which are made up of brave men, always prepared to risk their lives in the protection of ours. These thoughts are prompted by a member of the District of Columbia Fire Department who has recently been selected as Fireman of the Year, and I consider it a privilege to do honor to this man.

Charles M. Chamberlin, Jr., assigned to No. 1 platoon of engine company 16, and presently detailed to the deputy fire chief, has received this honor and he richly deserves it. Mr. Chamberlin has been a member of the District Fire Department for more than 17 years, during which he served in different engine and truck companies, and 5 years with

rescue squad No. 1. He also acted as aide to various battalion fire chiefs, and for the past 3 years he has been aide to Deputy Fire Chief Handback. Let me quote from a statement made about him by one of his superior officers:

Private Chamberlin has always demonstrated a keen interest in the Fire Department and is always ready to give his time to help others, from the lowest private to the highest ranking officer. When any member is sick or wounded he can always count on a visit from Charlie or "Doc" as he is called by all members who know him. In this respect he is largely responsible for the starting and smooth operating of the firemen's blood bank. His interest in this respect is not confined to the Fire Department alone since his record shows he has donated 52 pints of blood through the American Red Cross for the use of the Armed Forces or for other purposes for which they need it.

Private Chamberlin is a family man with a wife and one son. He is an active member of his church, a Mason, and has served as den father to a Cub Scout pack and on the executive committee of the Boy Scouts of America. He is popular with his comrades and is recognized as one who is always ready to help in a good cause.

I am proud to be able to speak of Charlie Chamberlin as my friend, and it is indeed a privilege to know him. The inspiration received from a character with such high and unselfish standards makes us very proud and eager to do our own tasks better and in a more cheerful spirit.

Persons Serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, Should Be Entitled To Continue To Accrue Educational Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has acted under the provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and issued a proclamation declaring the emergency period at an end on January 31, 1955. The effect of this declaration will be that persons in the Armed Forces will cease accruing eligibility as war veterans on January 31, 1955.

Entitlement to education and training is on an accrual basis. Entitlement is accrued at the rate of 1½ days of education or training for each day of service during the emergency period; therefore, the President's proclamation has the effect of discontinuing accrual of educational entitlement on January 31, 1955, for all persons in service on that date. This will mean that those individuals who have entered the armed services during the past few months will not have the opportunity to accrue sufficient educational entitlement to be of any practical value. A great many persons entered the armed forces during the past few months with the belief that they

would have the opportunity of accruing the maximum entitlement to education. Some of these persons maintain that they were urged by armed services recruiters to enter the service and discharge their military service obligation as soon as possible and at the same time gain entitlement to a free college education. I have received letters from service personnel contending that armed services recruiters appeared in high schools last June and urged high school graduates to join the service and stated that they would be entitled to maximum educational entitlement if they entered the service promptly.

In order that those individuals who have entered the service during a recent period will be dealt with fairly, I am introducing a bill which will permit an individual in the armed services on January 31, 1955, to continue to accrue entitlement to education and training on the basis of 1½ days educational entitlement for each day of service up to the date of his discharge or until he accrues maximum entitlement. Enactment of this bill will permit individuals who have been in service less than 24 months on January 31, 1955, to continue to count their service for the purpose of accruing educational entitlement up to a maximum of 24 months' service.

I believe that enactment of this legislation will eliminate the possibility that any individual has been misled or has been dealt with unfairly and at the same time will serve the basic intent of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. I hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee can give prompt consideration to this question as soon as it is organized.

Unjust Discrimination Against Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to correct an inequity of our tax laws which results in an unjust discrimination against members of our Armed Forces.

Last year, in our work on the mammoth new tax law, the House included a provision, section 37, which provided a tax credit equal to 20 percent of retirement incomes up to \$1,200 for individuals aged 65 and over. When the bill reached the other body, this section was amended to provide similar treatment for individuals under 65 with respect to pensions received from a public-retirement system. However, the amendment made by the other body specifically defined the term "public-retirement system" so as to exclude a retirement system operated for the benefit of the Armed Forces. That amendment with the exception I have just described finally prevailed in conference.

As a result, under the law as it now stands, a retired schoolteacher, policeman, fireman, or other civil servant is entitled to the retirement income-tax credit even if he retires before age 65. On the other hand, a member of our Armed Forces who similarly retires before age 65 is not entitled to equivalent treatment. I can find no justification whatsoever for continuing this type of discrimination against individuals who have served in their country's uniform. The bill which I have introduced today simply removes the exclusion of the Armed Forces from the definition of public-retirement system. The amendment would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, the effective date of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a very brief and comprehensive bill (H. R. 3) on the subject of States rights, with particular reference to the present rule of the United States Supreme Court that where Congress has enacted legislation on any subject, the States are deprived of all power to enact or enforce similar laws on the same subject even though not in conflict with the Federal act.

What the bill seeks to do is to modify this doctrine so as to permit concurrent jurisdiction in order that the State act, where not in conflict with the Federal act, can be also enforced in the State courts for the protection of the State and its citizens.

The bill reads as follows:

That no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect. No act of Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act, unless there is a direct and positive conflict between an express provision of such act and such provision of the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

For a long time the Supreme Court has held that whenever the Congress enacted legislation on any subject, its jurisdiction becomes exclusive and no State law can be enforced. In late years, as you know, Congress has legislated pretty well all over the waterfront. Congress has stretched the Interstate Commerce laws and the general welfare laws to the point where they cover all the ills of mankind, while the Supreme Court has consistently held to its original decision that when Congress acts all State laws are nullified, whether in conflict with the Federal law or not.

I do not quarrel with the Supreme Court about its consistency in its decisions. As a matter of fact, I devoutly wish that that Court would stand by its own decisions so that we lawyers could know not only what the law is today, but what it will be tomorrow.

Understand, please, that this doctrine that the Federal jurisdiction is exclusive in all cases is not due to any constitutional provision.

On the contrary, the 10th amendment to the Constitution especially reserves to the States all powers not granted, and the Constitution itself only gives to the Federal courts jurisdiction in a very limited number of subjects. You will all recall from your study of history that a great stumbling block in the adoption of the Constitution lay in the stubborn reluctance of all the Colonies to relinquish any of their sovereign powers, and during the debates preceding the adoption of the Constitution in the various States there developed a general understanding that in order to further protect the sovereignty of the States and the rights of individuals there would immediately be proposed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights. The 10th, and final, amendment was the one that specifically reserved to the States and to the people all of the powers not granted to the Federal Government. The principle which I am now discussing and seek to modify is a rule of law enacted by the Supreme Court and has come to have as much force and effect as if it had been adopted as a part of the Constitution. The principle was debated and discussed in numerous early decisions of the Supreme Court, but the final decision which so drastically changed the intent of the framers of the Constitution was decided in 1842 in the famous case of *Gibbons against Ogden*, and was even then regarded as of such doubtful validity that it was adopted by a divided Court of 5 to 4, and that decision established the flat theory that when Congress passed a law Congress intended that all State laws should be superseded. I seek by this bill to have Congress say it had no such foolish intention in any case unless it said so.

Let me illustrate the iniquitous results of such a doctrine. I will use the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that caused me to introduce this bill. I am the author of the Smith Act that, among other things, makes it a crime to teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force. Forty-seven of the 48 States have some kind of laws against sedition and subversion. Pennsylvania undertook to prosecute a notorious Communist who was a citizen of that State under the State Sedition Act. The Supreme Court of that State, following the decisions above referred to, decided that as Congress had enacted the Smith Act it had withdrawn from all of the States the power to protect themselves from treasonable acts, and nullified all State laws on the subject whether the Congress intended to do so or not.

I was asked to introduce an amendment to the Smith Act to say that Congress in enacting the law intended no such harmful construction of it.

Obviously that case was merely a symptom of a dangerous disease that threatened to destroy completely the sovereignty of the States and was not the disease itself, and I decided to offer a separate bill to seek a cure of the whole malady.

The bill I have read is the result. To illustrate further, in a similar case of *Cloverleaf Co. against Patterson*, the State of Alabama for the protection of the health of its citizens sought to inspect the product of the *Cloverleaf Co.*, which was engaged in the renovation of butter, some of which was shipped in interstate commerce and subject to inspection under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act. The Supreme Court held that as Congress had enacted the pure food laws it has assumed entire jurisdiction over the subject and the States were powerless to enforce their laws for the protection of the health of their citizens. I mention that case because the best argument I can think of for my bill is contained in the dissenting opinion of Justice Frankfurter who can, by no stretch of the imagination, be called a reactionary. He said:

The Department of Agriculture not only urged the enactment (of the Federal statute involved in the case), it drafted its provisions. If the Department wanted Congress to withdraw from the States their power to condemn unsanitary packing stock and to confide such power in the Federal Government, it could easily have made appropriate provision in the draft submitted by it to Congress. However, the Department did not do so. It did ask Congress to make some restrictions upon the authority which had been exercised by the States in regulating the manufacture and sale of butter for the protection of their citizens. But the restrictions did not include withdrawal from the States of the power to condemn unhealthful packing stock butter. The sponsors of this legislation, the experts of the Department of Agriculture, could have submitted to Congress appropriate language for the accomplishment of that result. They did not do so. The Court now does it for them even though the Department has no such desire.

To require the various agencies of the Government who are the effective authors of legislation like that now before us to express clearly and explicitly their purpose in dislodging constitutional powers of States—if such is their purpose—makes for care in draftsmanship and for responsibility in legislation. To hold, as do the majority, that paralysis of State power is somehow to be found in the vague implications of the Federal renovated butter enactments is to encourage slipshodness in draftsmanship and irresponsibility in legislation.

It must be obvious to you that with the multitude of subjects which the Congress is now dealing, that it is inevitably merely a question of time before the States will be deprived of practically all power and sovereignty in enactment and enforcement of laws for the protection of the health and welfare of their local citizens. In many Federal laws action to remedy wrongs must be initiated by some Federal bureau. Under present law, if the Federal bureau fails to act or refuses to act, the citizen is without remedy. In many instances adequate remedy requires immediate injunctive relief. Delay incident to bureaucratic redtape or indifference can mean finan-

cial ruin. Such instances have occurred and are occurring with more frequency.

Under present conditions, if the Federal authorities fail or refuse to act, the citizen is utterly without remedy.

The overall objective of the bill was well stated by the President when speaking on the subject of States rights. He made the following statement:

I want to see maintained the constitutional relationships between the Federal and State Governments. * * * For, if the States lose their meaning, our entire system of government loses its meaning. And the next step is the rise of the centralized, national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow. * * * We will see that the legitimate rights of the States and local communities are respected. * * * We will not reach into the States and take from them their powers and responsibilities to serve their citizens.

I hope the measure may have the support and active aid of all those who believe in the sovereignty of their States, who believe that local self-government is the best government, and who believe, as expressed by the President, that the rise of the centralized national state creates the atmosphere in which "the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow," to help me to help the President to put life and meaning into his inspired words.

Don't Bankrupt the American Crabbing Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Japan, last year, supplied about 60 percent of all the canned crab that was sold in the United States. American producers supplied only about 40 percent.

Despite the fact that there is, under existing law, a 22½ percent ad valorem—on value—tariff on imported canned crab and a 15 percent ad valorem duty on fresh and frozen crab, Japan dominates the American crab market. Japan is able to do this because wages in canned food industries are 8 cents an hour for women and not more than 19½ cents for men. American wages in the crabbing industry are many times those paid workers in Japan. In fact, most workers in the American crabbing industry are paid more for an hour's labor than the corresponding Japanese worker is paid for an entire day's work.

Despite the fact that Japan already sells 60 percent of all the canned crab marketed in the United States, the Committee on Reciprocity Information has announced that it will consider at an international conference at Geneva in February granting reductions in the existing 22½ percent tariff on canned crab and 15 percent on fresh and frozen crab. If these crab tariffs are reduced, I am convinced American crab producers

will lose most of the 40 percent of the domestic sales they still enjoy. If this happens the American crabbing industry will face ruination and bankruptcy.

American cannerymen have invested millions of dollars in building fine, modern, and sanitary canneries that are a model of cleanliness for the packing of crab. Fishermen have invested other millions in fishing boats and gear. A lowering at Geneva of the existing tariffs on crab will wipe out most of these investments. The fishermen and the cannery workers are not the only ones, however, who will suffer if the American crabbing industry is wrecked, as it surely will be, if existing crab tariffs are lowered.

Boatbuilders, the manufacturers of crabbing gear and those who supply goods and services to fishermen and cannery workers also will suffer.

Even under existing tariffs, Japanese producers are giving the American crabbing industry a tough time. In 1950, crab imports from Japan were 1,761,000 pounds and by 1953 had increased to 3,860,880 pounds. Crab imports from Japan more than doubled in those 3 years.

During the same years, the American canned crab pack declined from 137,490 cases to 114,886 cases, a decrease of more than 20 percent.

In short, during the years 1950 to 1953, the latest years for which complete statistics are available, Japan increased her shipments of crab into the United States by more than 100 percent and our domestic American pack of crabmeat declined 20 percent.

There is a strong feeling among most Americans that our country should do nothing that in any way will aid or strengthen Russia whose leaders, nowadays, are doing everything they can to embarrass and harass the United States. If we, at Geneva, lower tariffs in an effort to aid Japan, we are apt also to be helping Russia.

If additional markets for Japanese crab are opened in the United States by lower tariffs on crab imports, Japan, then naturally, will seek to expand her crab take and crab production. Under the Yalta Treaty the Allies gave to Russia great areas of the crabbing waters which Japan, previously, had owned, controlled, and fished.

Japan to fill orders for the expanded American market, which will be created for Japanese crab if tariffs on crabmeat are lowered, undoubtedly, will buy crab from the Russians and pack it under a canned-in-Japan label and then ship this Russian crab into the United States. Or, if not that, Japan could obtain from Russia at a price fishing rights for Japanese fishermen to fish the waters that once belonged to Japan but which we, at Yalta, gave to Russia. Thus, opening our American market to increased imports of crab by lowering existing tariffs could prove to be of great financial benefit to the Russians.

The American crabbing industry is not the only American industry which will suffer from the increased influx of foreign crab meat which the lowering of crab tariffs will encourage. All American shell fish industries—oyster, lobster, and shrimp industries—also will be hurt.

If Japanese shipments of crab into the United States increase due to lowered tariffs—and these shipments will increase if tariffs are lowered—the imported crab produced by low-wage, low-living standard Japanese labor, will be sold at prices below that of shrimp, oysters, lobsters, and other shellfish. As a result of low priced Japanese crab flooding our market, the price on crab cocktails will drop below those made of other shellfish. Oysters, shrimp, and lobster will have to meet these lower Japanese crab meat prices which American oyster, lobster, and shrimp producers cannot do because they, like those in the American crabbing industry, cannot compete with Japanese cannery labor which is paid as little as 8 cents an hour.

We also have a great and growing oyster industry on the Pacific coast which if the import duty on oysters is lowered at Geneva will suffer in the same ways the American crabbing industry will suffer.

In one community on Willapa Harbor, named Nahcotta, there are 5 oyster canneries, each of which employs 50 to 70 people. Other canneries operate on Willapa Harbor. This oyster industry is rated as a \$10 million one. It can be greatly weakened, even wiped out, by further growth in the oyster imports from Japan.

Most of those who are engaged in the oyster and crabbing industries of the Pacific coast have their life savings invested in canneries, boats, and gear. Their continued activity is of utmost importance to all the people in the fishing communities where these businesses operate. Lowering of tariffs on Japanese crab and oysters very well might make ghost towns out of these fishing communities.

Health Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 84th Congress I introduced several bills to make available means by which facilities to promote the health of our people would be more generally available than at the present time.

The seven bills I have introduced are designed to help the American people to bear the burden of hospital and medical expenses and to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds in promoting the health of the American people. These bills are the result of very extensive hearings and committee consideration of health programs proposed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the 83d Congress during which I had the privilege of being chairman of the committee.

My first bill—H. R. 397—is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage-loan insurance for

hospitals and medical facilities. The purpose of this bill is to stimulate investment of private capital in the construction of hospitals and medical facilities and thus to increase the availability of adequate medical facilities in which health services may be rendered to the American people. This bill would supplement the hospital-construction amendments—Public Law 482, 83d Congress—by channeling private funds into the construction of hospitals and medical facilities.

My second bill—H. R. 398—is a reintroduction of the bill, H. R. 7700, introduced by me during the 83d Congress.

This bill is based on the same principle as my first bill, but the mortgage-loan insurance provided for in the bill for hospitals and medical facilities would be available only for hospitals and medical facilities used in connection with voluntary prepayment health plans. These plans, of which the Kaiser Foundation in California and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Group Health Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C., are outstanding examples, have been particularly successful in furnishing comprehensive medical care to the members and subscribers of these plans in return for monthly premiums paid by the members and subscribers.

My third bill—H. R. 399—which is a reintroduction of H. R. 6950, 83d Congress, is designed to assist nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term interest-bearing loans advanced to such associations by the Federal Government.

While the first three bills introduced by me are designed to facilitate the construction of hospitals and medical facilities, my fourth bill—H. R. 400—is designed to provide improved protection for an increased number of our citizens under prepayment health plans. This bill is a reintroduction of H. R. 8356 which was reported favorably by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 83d Congress. The bill would establish a limited Federal reinsurance service with a self-sustaining fund derived from reinsurance premiums paid by the sponsors of health service prepayment plans participating in the program.

My fifth bill—H. R. 401—is a reintroduction of the bill, H. R. 6949, introduced by me during the 83d Congress. Like my fourth bill, it is designed to expand health services through the medium of Government reinsurance. However, the bill is limited to non-profit associations which render or secure medical and hospital services and does not extend to commercial health insurance companies. This bill is of particular importance, I feel, because it sets forth minimum standards which insurance plans must meet in order to become eligible for reinsurance under the plan proposed by the bill.

My sixth bill—H. R. 402—would amend the Internal Revenue Code and authorize a deduction up to \$100 for income-tax purposes for any taxpayer, and \$100 for each of his dependents for insurance premiums or fees paid to

health insurance companies and voluntary prepayment plans. This deduction would be in addition to deductions for medical expenses now authorized under the Federal income-tax laws. This deduction would stimulate individuals to prepay their medical expenses by participating in health insurance plans.

My last bill—H. R. 403—is a reintroduction of H. R. 7397 introduced by me during the 83d Congress. This bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was passed by the House of Representatives. The purpose of this bill is to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services by providing for a more effective use of available Federal funds.

It is my hope that this series of bills will enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and in the case of the tax deduction bill, the Committee on Ways and Means—and the House of Representatives to give careful consideration to plans designed to ease the economic burden which illness, and particularly prolonged illnesses, places on the American people. The 83d Congress enacted much-needed amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. It is my hope that the 84th Congress will follow up the action of the 83d Congress by enacting several of the measures which I have introduced.

Production of Wheat for Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will permit the farmers of the Nation to produce wheat for feed, without penalty, if all of the wheat produced is fed where grown and no price support is desired.

Under the present law, when marketing quotas have been voted for wheat, farmers who harvest wheat in excess of their allotment are subject to penalty. Farmers who produce wheat only for feed and who do not want price support on their wheat or any other crop are forced to curtail their operations and are in violation of the law and subject to penalty if they fail to do so. This is true even though the farmer uses his entire production of wheat solely to feed his own cattle or poultry. This situation is an intolerable and unnecessary interference with the operation of our country's farms and has been the source of widespread dissatisfaction among our farmers.

The ridiculousness and downright injustice of the situation are obvious. Many small farmers who raise wheat solely to feed their own cattle or poultry are forced to put that wheat into storage and then buy the wheat they need for feed purposes. This is an indefensible

example of Government regulation run wild.

Wheat used for feed on the farm where produced does not enter any marketing channels. Its production does not affect the operation of price supports and, therefore, should be exempted from marketing quotas. My bill will accomplish that purpose. I shall press for its early consideration by the Congress.

Saline Water Conversion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend the Saline Water Act of 1952, to provide for its uninterrupted continuation and to enable the officials in charge of the program to have the advantage of a limited amount of technical assistance from existing Federal scientific facilities. I authored the 1952 legislation which initiated the saline water conversion program. This program, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, has the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting saline water to fresh water. I am concerned at all times over our diminishing water supplies, both in this country and throughout the world. As the water needs of our country grow and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our well being and to our overall national economy is impressed upon us more and more.

I have followed closely the program which has been conducted under the 1952 legislation. Much progress has been made and it now seems clear that the results of the research and the studies now under way will, if given time, result in large-scale conversion of salt water to fresh water for municipal and industrial purposes. It also seems clear that, in time, conversion of sea water as well as brackish water for agricultural purposes in certain areas will be achieved. Although it had been thought that the extension of the program should be made toward the close of the initial 5-year period progress now indicates clearly the desirability of assuring at this time continuity and some minor expansion of activity to accommodate and make full use of the initial results now flowing in. There should be no slowdown or interruption in the program, and both the Department and private industry, which has assisted in the research, should be given assurance by this Congress that the program will be continued. For these reasons, I am introducing legislation at this time.

The Secretary of the Interior has just transmitted to the Congress his third annual report covering this program, and I am pleased to report briefly to my colleagues upon the progress that has been made.

The Department of the Interior accomplishes this saline water conservation program by conducting scientific research and development through federally financed grants and contracts, encouraging such development by correlating and coordinating efforts in this field, and stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the problem. Private development of processes is being encouraged, and a few industrial firms have undertaken independent research in this field during the past year, and the Department has received wholehearted cooperation from several organizations now engaged in these activities.

At the beginning of the program, the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was about \$400 to \$500 an acre-foot. Accordingly, an arbitrary criterion was set for the initial phase of the program, for water for municipal and industrial purposes. This goal was \$125 per acre-foot—38 cents per 1,000 gallons—which was believed, on the basis of available data, to represent about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use. It was thought that if this goal could be approached during the initial phase, further reduction might be possible in a second phase.

The work accomplished so far indicates that attainment of the first goal of obtaining fresh water from sea water at a price which municipal users and some industries might pay, and the conversion of brackish water to irrigation uses, seems to be in sight although much work will be necessary before either can be brought to realization. The task of converting sea water for irrigation is more difficult but the researches continually produce new ideas and one of these may well point a way to its attainment.

Some of the investigations initiated earlier in this program have been completed and the results described. Other research investigations are being continued and many new research and development problems are being studied. All of these are described in some detail in the third annual report covering the program.

The report indicates that during the past year 39 proposals for research were evaluated formally and several dozen additional suggestions were considered. Eleven new research and development contracts were let. Work under 11 other research contracts initiated earlier was completed with affirmative results definitely justifying further research in 8. Two processes give promise of converting sea water at less than half present costs, and one for brackish water has reached pilot-plant stage and is being field tested. Information has been obtained and exchanged on developments in this field in the United States and more than a dozen other countries from Europe to Australia.

I am advised that progress during the year has demonstrated the need for a central governmental program of this nature having no interest in the development of one industrial process over another. Few industrial firms appear to

feel justified in carrying the development of saline water conversion equipment further than improvements in present equipment. However, to reach the ultimate objective of the program—demineralized water in large quantities at a small fraction of present costs for the general economic benefit—more than minor improvements in processes are needed. The governmental program would assure that research and development would be continued persistently, including minor local improvements in processes, until in time, low-cost water in large quantities was made available to the general public.

The report indicates that, during 1954, new light has also been cast upon the direction which the program should take in the development of unconventional energy sources for demineralization. The energy required for extracting 1 acre-foot of fresh water from sea water is about 900 kilowatt-hours. From research under the program, it has been estimated that the minimum that might be reached in practice would probably be 4 to 5 times that quantity. Thus the energy cost alone would not be less than about \$20 per acre-foot at 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The amortized cost of equipment and the cost of operation would probably at least equal the energy cost. This is for sea water, and the costs are generally less for brackish waters. Thus it becomes important that nonconventional low-cost energy such as solar energy, for example, be explored in connection with process development and use.

I am pleased to hear that the nine eminent members of educational, scientific, and industrial organizations who, at the beginning of the program, agreed to serve as advisers to the Secretary on broad policy matters, are all continuing to serve in this capacity and that they have provided some very substantial advice and assistance.

Pray for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reintroduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp, or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace."

An identical measure which I introduced in the 83d Congress was passed in the House on August 18, 1954, but Congress adjourned before the Senate took action. It is my hope that the bill which I introduced yesterday will be enacted into law during this Congress. This legislation would send the message of "Pray for Peace" on United States mail throughout the land, and to the far corners of the world. It would remind the world of our dependence upon God.

An Explanation of Health Bills Introduced in the 84th Congress by Congressman Wolverton, Republican, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as previously stated I introduced on the opening day of this 84th Congress, January 5, 1955, several bills, the underlying purpose of which is to provide improved facilities and ways and means to promote the health of our people. I believe each of these bills, or bills similar thereto, and, embodying the fundamental principles thereof, would have a very beneficial effect in meeting the present tremendously high cost of hospitalization and medical attention.

In order that these bills may have the fullest possible understanding and thereby create sufficient interest to bring about enactment, I am making an explanation of each of them, as follows:

H. R. 397, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MORTGAGE-LOAN INSURANCE FOR HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

The principal purposes of the bill, H. R. 397, are:

First, to stimulate lending institutions, through Government insurance of mortgages, to loan funds for the construction of privately owned medical centers, hospitals, clinics, and other health facilities operated on a self-sustaining basis; and

Second, to encourage the extension of voluntary prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care of high quality to the people at reasonable costs within their means.

In order to accomplish these purposes, the bill would create a Health Facilities Mortgage Insurance Fund. The amount of contingent insurance liability would be limited to \$200 million, except that with the approval of the President, such amount may be increased by additional amounts aggregating \$150 million. Mortgages on qualified health facilities would be insured (subject to 10-percent co-insurance) up to 80 percent of the value of such facility. Interest would be fixed at 5 percent with a maximum of 6 percent if the Secretary finds the higher interest rate necessary.

Title II of the bill would set aside for a period of 2 years after the date of the enactment of the bill not less than \$40 million of the total insurance liability authorized by the bill for the insurance of mortgages covering health facilities used primarily in connection with the operation of group prepayment health service plans. This reservation is designed to make certain that a sufficient share of the fund will be available to encourage the extension of group practice prepayment health plans.

The principal objective of the bill, H. R. 397, is to encourage the flow of

private capital into the construction and equipment of hospitals and medical facilities. This bill would supplement the Hospital Construction Act, as broadened by the 83d Congress, Public Law 482, which makes available Federal funds for the construction of hospitals and medical facilities.

The bill is based on the extensive experience which the Federal Government has had with the insurance of mortgages on residential housing, including single-family residences and apartments, and contains all of the legislative safeguards provided for in the Housing Act of 1954, enacted by the 83d Congress—Public Law 560—designed to prevent certain abuses which were discovered in connection with the housing program.

H. R. 398, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MORTGAGE LOAN INSURANCE FOR HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES USED IN CONNECTION WITH VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT HEALTH PLANS

H. R. 398 is a reintroduction, in substance, of the bill H. R. 7700, introduced by me on February 3, 1954, during the 83d Congress. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate private lending institutions, through Government insurance of mortgages, to loan funds by which medical centers, hospitals, clinics, and other medical facilities operated in conjunction with voluntary prepayment health plans, can be constructed and operated on a self-sustaining basis.

The further purpose of the bill is to increase the opportunities and facilities by which doctors may associate themselves together in groups, partnerships, and other private initiative arrangements of their own choosing, in order to broaden the distribution of high quality medical care through general practitioners and specialists working together, making the most efficient use of medical schools, facilities, and equipment and emphasizing preventive medicine, detection of diseases, and early diagnosis.

The bill, H. R. 398, is based on the extensive experience of prepayment plans offering comprehensive services in many parts of the country today, as for example, the Kaiser Foundation in California, the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Group Health Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C.

The bill would create a medical facilities mortgage insurance fund. The amount of contingent insurance liability at any one time may not exceed \$300 million, except that with the approval of the President, such aggregate amount may be increased at any time by additional amounts aggregating not more than \$150 million. Mortgages on qualified health facilities would be fully insured up to 90 percent of the value of such facility. Interest would be fixed at 5 percent with a maximum of 6 percent if the Secretary finds the higher interest rate necessary.

The bill is based on the extensive experience which the Federal Government has had with mortgage loan insurance in the field of residential housing, including both single family residences and apartments.

H. R. 399, A BILL TO ASSIST VOLUNTARY NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATIONS OFFERING PREPAID HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS TO SECURE NECESSARY FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT THROUGH LONG-TERM, INTEREST-BEARING LOANS

H. R. 399 is similar to H. R. 6950, 83d Congress which was introduced by me on January 6, 1954. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate the organization of additional, and assist in the expansion of existing, voluntary nonprofit prepayment health associations by making available long-term Government loans. The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$5 million each for the current and following fiscal years and \$10 million for each of the next 3 succeeding fiscal years.

The bill H. R. 399 is designed to supplement other bills introduced by me which are intended to stimulate the flow of private capital into the construction of health facilities used by voluntary health associations.

The bill would be administered by the Surgeon General acting with the advice of the Health Services Facilities Council. The Council would consist of representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, and 12 members to be appointed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who are recognized as leaders in the field of medical economics, medical administration, or public affairs.

H. R. 400, A BILL TO IMPROVE THE PUBLIC HEALTH BY ENCOURAGING MORE EXTENSIVE USE OF THE VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT METHOD IN THE PROVISION OF PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICES

This bill is similar to H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, in the form in which that bill was reported favorably on July 9, 1954, by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—House Report 2106. H. R. 8356 was introduced in the House by me on March 11, 1954, to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations contained in his health message submitted to the 83d Congress on January 18, 1954.

The present bill, H. R. 400, provides for the establishment of a health reinsurance program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It creates a reinsurance fund and authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$25 million to provide advances of working capital for the fund. The fund would be built up over a period of time from reinsurance premiums and from earnings of the fund. Reinsurance would be available on a voluntary basis and upon payment of a reinsurance premium, to private insurance companies, voluntary nonprofit health associations, such as Blue Cross and other organizations offering prepayment health insurance plans. The proposal is designed to encourage private insurance organizations to experiment in providing broader voluntary health insurance to more people.

The bill also provides for technical and advisory information services to health service prepayment plans.

The bill H. R. 400 incorporates certain provisions, which were adopted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in reporting favorably H. R.

8356, 83d Congress, to meet questions raised by various witnesses in the course of the committee hearings held during the 83d Congress. The most important of such questions was based on the fear that the bill could be interpreted to permit some degree of Federal regulation of the health-insurance industry. This bill seeks to remove any and all fear in that respect.

The central philosophy of the bill is one of building on our existing system of voluntary insurance and of providing supporting services and a financial backstop for private effort toward the expansion of prepayment protection. The bill, if enacted, would not of itself directly provide insurance coverage for individuals. Its goal is the removal of obstacles to the extension of coverage for broader ranges of benefits and to additional groups of people.

H. R. 401, A BILL TO FACILITATE THE BROADER DISTRIBUTION OF HEALTH SERVICES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The bill, H. R. 401, is similar to H. R. 6949, 83d Congress, introduced by me on January 6, 1954. A similar bill was first introduced by me at the close of the 81st Congress—H. R. 8746.

Like H. R. 400, it is designed to expand health services through the medium of Government reinsurance. However, the bill makes eligible for reinsurance only nonprofit associations which render or secure medical and hospital services and does not extend to commercial health insurance companies.

The bill H. R. 401 differs from H. R. 400 in other important respects. H. R. 401 sets forth detailed standards which must be met by a voluntary health association in order to be eligible for reinsurance. Subscription fees charged by the association must be fixed as a percentage of income. The association must accept any nongroup applicant subject to certain limitations with regard to subscribers residing outside the geographical area which the association serves. Additional hospital and physician's charges to subscribers must not exceed 25 percent of benefits. Subscribers must pay \$1 per day, or 5 percent, whichever is less, of any hospital bill incurred by the subscriber. The association must provide for payment of 75 percent of the cost of 12 doctor visits during any year, excluding however the first visit. The association must pay 95 percent of the cost of all medical services rendered to subscribers in hospitals.

Eligible associations would pay as reinsurance premium 2 percent of their premium income. They would be reimbursed out of the reinsurance fund to the extent of two-thirds of any claim in excess of \$1,000 submitted by a subscriber to an association. The reinsurance fund would be administered by a Government corporation to be known as the Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation.

H. R. 402, A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 213 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PERMIT THE DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO THE 3 PERCENT LIMITATION CONTAINED THEREIN

The bill, H. R. 402, is similar in principle to the bill H. R. 6952, 83d Congress,

introduced by me on January 6, 1954. The bill is designed to provide an inducement to individuals to prepay their medical expenses by participating in health insurance plans. H. R. 402 would amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit deduction from adjusted gross income of up to \$100 for amounts paid for health insurance and, similarly, up to \$100 for health insurance paid for each of the taxpayer's dependents. This deduction would be without regard to the 3 percent limitation now contained in section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H. R. 403, A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROMOTE AND ASSIST IN THE EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES, TO PROVIDE FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF AVAILABLE FEDERAL FUNDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The bill, H. R. 403, is similar to H. R. 7397, 83d Congress, in the form in which that bill passed the House of Representatives on April 27, 1954.

The bill, H. R. 403, is designed to provide a simplified formula for the distribution of Federal funds among the several States for public health programs and to permit the States to use greater initiative and to take more responsibility in the administration of these programs.

Under existing law, six separate grant-in-aid programs to assist the States in developing and operating public health services are administered by the Public Health Service. One of these is a grant program for general public health services. The other programs are each for a separate disease category: venereal disease, tuberculosis, heart diseases, mental health, and cancer.

The bill H. R. 403, would consolidate and simplify the public health grant-in-aid system. In lieu of the general public health category and five separate disease categories, the bill would establish three new types of grants:

First. Support grants to assist the States in maintaining basic public health services;

Second. Extension and improvement grants to assist the States in meeting the cost of adding to and improving their public health services; and

Third. Special project grants to assist States or political subdivisions in meeting emergency public health problems in specific geographical areas, or public health problems common to several States, or public health problems for which the Federal Government has a special responsibility.

Support grants would be distributed in accordance with the present Hill-Burton formula.

Extension and improvement grants would be made on the following basis: During the first 2 years of a project, the Federal share would be 75 percent; during the second 2 years 50 percent; and during the final 2 years 25 percent.

No allotment formula is prescribed in the bill for special project grants. Instead, such awards are made by the Surgeon General on the basis of the comparative importance and immediacy of the various projects.

Invitation to House Members To Give House Un-American Activities Committee Their Ideas About Committee Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the executive meeting of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the 84th Congress, which committee meeting was held on January 20, presided over by the new chairman, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, the following three members were named as a subcommittee to consider and report back to the full committee on the subject of committee rules of procedure for the committee investigations and hearings during the 84th Congress. The subcommittee appointed was Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, California, chairman; Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, Louisiana; and Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE, Republican, Illinois.

During the 83d Congress your Committee on Un-American Activities operated under a printed and publicly announced and distributed set of rules from July 1953, and the same rules were approved for the committee's operations for the 84th Congress, subject to changes and amendments which may be adopted by the full committee, based upon the report of the Subcommittee on Rules in this statement announced. It was my pleasure to be chairman of the Committee on Rules for the committee during the 83d Congress. Mr. VELDE, full committee chairman, was the other member. We have been informed that it is probable that the rules promulgated and published by us on July 15, 1953, is the first time in recent history, at any rate, of Congress, that such a set of rules was printed and distributed for the benefit of witnesses before congressional committees and for their legal counsel and also for the information of the public.

Pursuant to the continued desire of the House Un-American Activities Committee to have and receive the benefit at all times of the considered opinions of all Members of the House on this important subject of rules of procedure, I this day sent to all Members of the House the following invitation to participate in aiding the subcommittee in its submission of any changes or amendments to the full committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., January 21, 1955.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Good morning. Your House Un-American Activities Committee on yesterday named the following subcommittee to bring back to the committee, by February 20, its report and recommendation relating to the committee rules. The subcommittee is as follows: CLYDE DOYLE, California, chairman; EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana; and HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has been operating under a printed set of

rules which was publicly announced on July 15, 1953. I am placing those rules in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help you the better to cooperate with your committee and to have an opportunity for your expression of opinion and recommendations as to any additional or different rules and procedures which you may wish to recommend to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This is a cordial invitation for you to send me on or before Tuesday, February 1, what you wish your Committee on Un-American Activities to consider in this matter of rules of procedure for the committee.

Address your communication as follows: Representative CLYDE DOYLE, of California, 1030 House Office Building.

With best wishes to you for a year of achievement and satisfaction, I have the honor to be,

Your colleague,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—The present rules of the House Un-American Activities Committee will appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, January 24, or Tuesday, January 25, with extension of remarks by me.

Said full committee will receive the subcommittee report on or about February 20. Although the rules of procedure which guided the committee during the 83d Congress, subsequent to July 1953, when they were adopted were announced in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD promptly after adoption and were reported to the full committee by the subcommittee consisting of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, chairman, and Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE. I am sure that all the Members of the House, and especially the new Members, will appreciate having the text of the existing rules brought to their attention, as it will clearly help all the Members to promptly consider what changes, amendments, or additions they would recommend; and then to promptly send these changes and recommendations to me on or before February 1.

The Committee on Un-American Activities for the 84th Congress consists of the following: FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman; HAROLD H. VELDE; BERNARD W. KEARNEY; DONALD L. JACKSON; EDWIN E. WILLIS; GORDON H. SCHERER; MORGAN M. MOULDER; CLYDE DOYLE; and JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.

Said rules now in effect, and which were printed in a handy, attractive booklet for distribution to all witnesses, counsel, and other interested parties are as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CONTENTS

	Page
Public Law 601, 79th Congress (excerpt).....	IV
Rules adopted by 83d Congress (excerpt).....	V
Rules of procedure:	
Initiation of investigations.....	1
Subjects of investigation.....	1
Subpoenaing of witnesses.....	1
Executive and public hearings.....	2
Testimony under oath.....	3
Transcript of testimony.....	3
Advice of counsel.....	3
Conduct of counsel.....	4
Statement by witness.....	5
Rights of persons affected by a hearing.....	5
Admissibility of testimony.....	7
Relationship of husband and wife.....	7
Televised hearings.....	7
Committee reports.....	8
Witness' fees and travel allowance.....	8
Contempt of Congress.....	9
Distribution of rules.....	9

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * *

"Part 2—Rules of the House of Representatives

"Rule X

"Section 121. Standing committees

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"Rule XI

"Powers and duties of committees

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American Activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. Initiation of investigations: No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee. Preliminary inquiries, however, may be initiated by the committee's staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

II. Subjects of investigation: The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned or shall otherwise appear shall be announced in an opening statement to the committee before the commencement of any hearings; and the information sought to be elicited at the hearings shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated.

III. Subpoenaing of witnesses:

A. Subpenas shall be signed and issued by the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by said chairman.

B. Witnesses shall be subpoenaed at a reasonably sufficient time in advance of any hearing, said time to be determined by the committee, in order to give the witness an opportunity to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel, should he so desire.

IV. Executive and public hearings:

A. Executive:

(1) If a majority of the committee or subcommittee, duly appointed as provided

by the rules of the House of Representatives, believes that the interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might endanger national security or unjustly injure his reputation, or the reputation of other individuals, the committee shall interrogate such witness in an executive session for the purpose of determining the necessity or advisability of conducting such interrogation thereafter in a public hearing.

(2) Attendance at executive sessions shall be limited to members of the committee, its staff, and other persons whose presence is requested, or consented to by the committee.

(3) All testimony taken in executive sessions shall be kept secret and shall not be released or used in public sessions without the approval of a majority of the committee.

B. Public hearings:

(1) All other hearings shall be public.

V. Testimony under oath: All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify as to matters of fact shall give all testimony under oath or affirmation. Only the chairman or a member of the committee shall be empowered to administer said oath or affirmation.

VI. Transcript of testimony:

A complete and accurate record shall be kept of all testimony and proceedings at hearings, both in public and in executive session.

Any witness or his counsel, at the expense of the witness, may obtain a transcript of any public testimony of the witness from the clerk of the committee.

Any witness or his counsel may also obtain a transcript of any executive testimony of the witness:

(1) When a special release of said testimony prior to public release is authorized by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any subcommittee; or

(2) After said testimony has been made public by the committee.

VII. Advice of counsel:

A. At every hearing, public or executive, every witness shall be accorded the privilege of having counsel of his own choosing.

B. The participation of counsel during the course of any hearing and while the witness is testifying shall be limited to advising said witness as to his legal rights. Counsel shall not be permitted to engage in oral argument with the committee, but shall confine his activity to the area of legal advice to his client.

VIII. Conduct of counsel:

Counsel for a witness shall conduct himself in a professional, ethical, and proper manner. His failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the committee or subcommittee before which the witness is appearing, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removing from the hearing room of counsel, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.¹

In case of such removal of counsel, the witness shall have a reasonable time to obtain other counsel, said time to be determined by the committee. Should the witness deliberately or capriciously fail or refuse to obtain the services of other counsel within such reasonable time, the hearing shall continue and the testimony of such witness shall be heard without benefit of counsel.

¹ The committee seeks factual testimony within the personal knowledge of the witness and such testimony and answers must be given by the witness himself and not suggested to witness by counsel.

IX. Statement by witness:

A. Any witness desiring to make a prepared or written statement² for the record of the proceedings in executive or public sessions shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel of the committee within a reasonable period of time in advance of the hearing at which the statement is to be presented.

B. All such statements so received which are relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation may, upon approval, at the conclusion of the testimony of the witness, by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee members present, be inserted in the official transcript of the proceedings.

X. Rights of persons affected by a hearing:

A. Where practicable, any person named in a public hearing before the committee or any subcommittee as subversive, Fascist, Communist, or affiliated with one or more subversive-front organizations, who has not been previously so named, shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, be notified by registered letter, to the address last known to the committee, of such fact, including:

(1) A statement that he has been so named.

(2) The date and place of said hearing.

(3) The name of the person who so testified.

(4) The name of the subversive, Fascist, Communist, or front organization with which he has been identified; and

(5) A copy of the printed rules of procedure of the committee.

B. Any person, so notified, who believes that his character or reputation has been adversely affected or to whom has been imputed subversive activity, may within 15 days after receipt of said notice:

(1) Communicate with the counsel of the committee,³ and/or

(2) Request to appear at his own expense in person before the committee or any subcommittee thereof in public session and give testimony, in denial or affirmation, relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

C. Any such person testifying under the provisions of B (2) above shall be accorded the same privileges as any other witness appearing before the committee, and may be questioned concerning any matter relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

XI. Admissibility of testimony: A witness shall be limited to giving information relevant and germane to the subject under investigation. The committee shall rule upon the admissibility of all testimony or information presented by the witness.⁴

² Statements which take the form of personal attacks by the witness upon the motives of the committee, the personal characters of any Members of the Congress or of the committee staff, and statements clearly in the nature of accusation are not deemed to be either relevant or germane.

³ All witnesses are invited at any time to confer with committee counsel or investigators for the committee prior to hearings.

⁴ The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a congressional committee, not a court (see pp. IV and V). Moreover, the committee has neither the authority nor the vast powers of a court of law.

A congressional committee conducts a search for information, not a trial.

The requirements of time, the nature of the fact-finding hearing, the complications of travel, the realities of expense, and the voluminous duties of Members of Congress all add together to make it impractical for courtroom procedure to be followed.

The committee has given frequent and diligent consideration to this subject, and has determined that in order to carry out its responsibilities imposed by law, the rules of evidence, including cross-examination, are not applicable.

XII. Relationship of husband and wife: The confidential relationship between husband and wife shall be respected, and for reasons of public policy, one spouse shall not be questioned concerning the activities of the other, except when a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall determine otherwise.

XIII. Televised hearings:

A. If a hearing be televised:

(1) Television facilities in the hearing room shall be restricted to two cameras, the minimum lighting facilities practicable, and the television production shall be available on a pool basis to all established television companies desiring participation.

(2) Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only, and this fact shall be publicly announced on television in the beginning and at the close of each telecast. No commercial announcements shall be permitted from the hearing room or in connection therewith, and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings shall be permitted in any instance.

B. Upon the request of a witness that no telecast shall be made of him during the course of his testimony, the chairman shall direct that television cameras refrain from photographing the witness during the taking of his testimony.

XIV. Committee reports:

A. No committee reports or publications shall be made or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the committee.

B. No summary of any committee report or publication and no statement of the contents of such report or publication shall be released by any member of the committee or its staff prior to the official issuance of the report.

XV. Witness fees and travel allowance:

Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee, may report to the office of the clerk of the committee, room 227, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees upon the committee. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D. C., the witness may contact the clerk of the committee, or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

XVI. Contempt of Congress: No recommendation that a witness be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House of Representatives unless and until the committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the alleged contempt, and by a majority of those present voted that such recommendation be made.

XVII. Distribution of rules: All witnesses appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities shall be furnished a printed copy of the rules of procedure of the committee.

A Bill To Have the Members of the House of Representatives Recite the Pledge of Allegiance on Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress, you will recall that my bill, House Joint Resolution 243, to include the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, received unanimous approval and it is now Public

Law 396, signed by the President on Flag Day, June 14, 1954. Yesterday, I introduced a House resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by inserting after "First. Prayer by the Chaplain" the following: "pledge of allegiance to the flag by the Members," led by the Speaker, to be recited annually, when the House is in session on Flag Day, June 14.

My Recent Visit to North Africa—Status of Jews in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during my recent trip to North Africa, I conferred with French Government officials, native chieftans, leaders of Jewish communities, Moorish Berbers, Moorish Jews, with Europeans and American military, naval, and Air Force personnel. I give, herewith, my impressions of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, with particular reference to the conditions of the Jews in those countries.

French Morocco has a population of 8,500,000. Of this number, roughly 214,000 are Jews. There are two divisions of Moroccan Jews: The Berbers, who live in the southern part of Morocco in the neighborhood of the Atlas Mountains, have been there for centuries—even before the Jews were banished from Spain. It is thought that they are the descendants of the Israelites driven out of Palestine by Joshua. The others are the Sephardic Jews—descendants of those who fled from Torquemada, who live in northern French Morocco.

The Berber Jews are nomadic and live chiefly in Saharan mountain villages. They are conspicuous by their black cloaks, black skull caps and round black hats. They hold steadfastly to the customs and faith of their ancestors.

In addition to these Jews, there are some tribal Jews—a fanatical sect who live deep in the Sahara Desert and in the Atlas Mountains. They are warlike and are a fierce looking people, and are known as the fighting warrior Jews of Morocco. They are said to be able to trek for hours and hours across the Atlas Mountain ranges with their children strapped across the backs of their women.

There are also some albino Jews residing in the mountain fastnesses along the coast. They are blond and have yellowish hair, pinkish eyes, and a reddish complexion.

The Sephardic Jews, to a great extent, live in the mellahs or ghettos. A mellah is found in every Moroccan city—Casablanca, Rabat, Marakeesh. In the mellah thousands of Jews have lived and suffered, persecuted for centuries. In the old days they never ventured forth.

To remain within the mellah was their best protection from the onslaughts of the Moors. The Jews have suffered and still suffer injury, misery, and humiliation. They are not even second-class citizens in Morocco. The very word "mellah" means salt. The Moor Caid in the old days were wont to decapitate the infidel or unfaithful or non-Moor and place the head upon a pike to be exhibited in the public square. The head, however, was first salted and pickled in vinegar. This was done by the Jewish butcher, and the word "mellah"—salt—was finally applied not only to the place or abode of the Jewish butcher but to the ghetto where the Jews lived as well.

The only protection for the Jews of Morocco is the French Government. If the French should now leave and independence is achieved, the life of no Jewish person would be worth a sou.

The independence party is called the Istiqlal Party. It is supported by the Moors of the north, but opposed by the Moorish Berbers of the south. The Berber Moors are controlled by an old feudal chieftain called El Gloui. El Gloui and the Berbers are opposed to independence and support the French. The French deposed the former Sultan Sidi Mohammed Ben Yussuf, who was a huge landowner and opposed French reforms. It was essential for the French to get rid of him. The French set up a new Sultan, Sidi Mulai Ben Araffa. This change of Sultans infuriated the Istiqlal Party, but was acceptable to El Gloui. The latter is friendly to the Jews, hates the Arab League, and is an admirer of the strides made by Israel. Incidentally, the private secretary is a Jew, Albert Berdugo.

The Jews take no part in the independence movement. They dare not. Silently, however, they are generally with the French. This is a natural point of view, since their survival and the safety of their families depend upon the French. However, they know they are sitting on a keg of dynamite. Recently some 6,000 have been screened by the Jewish agency for emigration to Israel. Most of the Jews in the mellah wish to go to Israel. The rich and middle-class Jews outside the mellah have not made up their minds. They do not want to lose their possessions in Morocco, yet they realize the danger that lurks around the corner.

I wish to emphasize that there is no disposition on the part of the Jewish agency, or any agency representing Israel, to encourage emigration from Morocco. There are enough voluntary applications for entrance to Israel to overtax the abilities of the Israeli representatives already. In other words, there is no need for encouragement.

Statements made that a "panic migration" has been stimulated are contrary to fact. There is no pressure from any source save the pressure of inner fear that possesses most Moroccan Jews. They realize that their safety lies with the French and that if the French go and independence descends upon Morocco with Istiqlal in power, then their doom is sealed. Then the pogrom at Petit-Jean would become the genocide of

Morocco. Almost 30,000 will be taken into Israel during the coming year. That is not "panic migration." More are clamoring to go if conditions do not become better. Israel may in the future be compelled to siphon off more than 30,000 a year. The numbers that covet entry into Israel will depend upon the degree of banditry of the Istiqlal and the terrorists.

I honestly believe that Jews would be content to remain if they were given a fair degree of equality with their Moorish neighbors, were assured of their personal security, and that of their dear ones. But one would be insane to deny the menace to all Jewry if an uninhibited nationalist Morocco and a frenzied Moslem Brotherhood would control.

Presently the great roadblock to Moroccan Jewry's road to human dignity is the question of nationality. Citizenship in Morocco cannot be acquired. A Jew is merely the feudal subject of the Sultan. The Sultan and his Caid are the ruling cult. There is no political equality, no social integration. The Jew is a Moroccan but with no rights of a Moroccan. Such condition of servitude was bearable so long as Jewry lived within the small confines of the mellah. But enlightenment could not be kept from the Jews even in the dark dismal mellah. Their aspirations have been raised. Their alien status has become obnoxious and intolerable.

Now superimposed upon their misery is the danger of extermination. No wonder they really and truly pray: "Next year in Jerusalem."

There are many wealthy and cultivated Jews in Morocco. They have a long tradition of cultivation reaching back into medieval Spain, but the great mass of Jews in Morocco live in mellahs. There in squalor, despair, degradation they live more like animals. Their position is beyond description. This is especially so in the Casablanca mellah.

Organizations like the Joint Distribution Committee, the World Jewish Congress, the ORT, The Jewish National Fund, and so forth, are doing heroic work amongst the Jews. The French Government does its best with its limited resources. The French are increasing their subventions to help ameliorate the condition of the Jews. They have set up some housing to relieve mellah congestion. The government granted to the Alliance Israelite considerable sums for schools. But vast sums of money are needed to deal with the perplexing problems of housing, education, cultural development, and political emancipation. The entire Jewish world must give these questions most anxious consideration. I particularly stress the good work of the Alliance Israelite which brings education into the remotest and darkest parts of the Jewish dispersion in Morocco. I have seen some of the magnificent schools built by this worthy organization.

The Istiqlal Party is encouraged by the Spanish radio beamed into Morocco from Tetuan, capital of Spanish Morocco—encouraged also by Nasser's radio in Egypt and by the Communist radio in Budapest, Hungary. The opposition to the French make strange bedfellows

out of the Communists, Egypt, and Spain. The Istiqlal Party draws some of its funds by way of extortion. Letters are frequently received by Jewish merchants demanding sums of money to be deposited in a given place at a given time. If the demands are not complied with, their places of business or residence are threatened with fire, or they are threatened with kidnaping. The defenseless smaller Jewish merchant complies with the demand of extortion. The rich Jew, who knows how to protect himself, refuses to comply. A few months ago, eight Jews were killed in cold blood in Petit-Jean, a village not far from Casablanca. Their bodies were soaked in oil and burned in public. They were victims of the riotous Istiqlal.

As recently as January 6, a bomb was thrown into a Jewish shoeshop in Casablanca. Fifteen persons were wounded by the blast and the anti-French terrorists, the Istiqlal Party, are believed responsible for this barbarous deed. It is just such acts of violence that drive Jews to Israel.

The United States has expressed neutrality in the feud between the French and the Moroccans. United States has 5 bases, necessary for the defense of the free world, spread over Morocco—4 airbases and 1 naval base. We cannot long remain neutral for the good and sufficient reason that if the French leave, it would take 5 to 6 divisions of our troops to defend those bases. If the French remain these bases can be held with a battalion. Our important stake in Morocco requires at least an expression of opinion favorable to the French. Assuredly if the Istiqlal outrages are stepped up our State Department has the duty of protesting. Usually persecution is not confined into any tight compartment. Persecution of Jews becomes persecution of Europeans and other minorities. It would eventually embrace all foreigners including Americans.

If the French leave, the new Moroccan Government would say, "What right have you Americans to hold these bases?" The answer could be: "We made a 99-year treaty with the French." The Moroccans would retort: "You made no treaty with us. We recognize no treaty with the French. Get out."

Moroccan Jews, understandably, take no outward sides in the political controversy raging between Istiqlal and the French. They do at times differ among themselves as to the degree of severity and repression, or even the wisdom thereof, that some local French officers take against the nationalists. Many think that extreme force begets more violence and hastens the coming of a revolution. Some prefer a gradual liberal approach of the French leading to eventual independence.

But if Jews in Morocco deliberately are fearful of taking sides, Jews outside of Morocco cannot bury their heads in the sand. They can take sides. I must take sides with fellow Jews and against the persecution of the Istiqlal.

The Istiqlal, it should be noted, has an extremely active office in Washington, D. C., and its principal protagonist there, I am told, is a man who was born

a Polish Jew, became a British Protestant, and is now a Catholic American.

The French, having been taught a costly lesson in Indochina, are no longer guilty of colonialism in Morocco. At long last they are now keenly interested in raising the standard of living of the natives and are putting into Morocco far more treasure than they are taking out.

It is my firm conviction that the Moroccans are not yet ready for independence. Considering their centuries-old illiteracy, their religious fanaticism, and feudalism it will take time to educate and alert them to the ways of independence. Freedom does not always mean democracy. Their freedom would not bring democracy. They do not know the meaning, yet, of the word. I am not going into the reasons for their despair and illiteracy. True democracy would mean protection for minorities, including the Jews, European inhabitants from France, Spain, Italy, and other inhabitants. But an independent Morocco at this time would not mean true democracy. These minorities would be unsafe if independence were to be given to the Moroccans at the present time. Giving independence to Morocco would be like giving an automobile to a child. The child would not understand the mechanism of the automobile. Even with a book of rules the child would not understand how to apply them. So Moroccans would not now understand the constitution that might be given them, nor its application to government. Morocco must wait for independence.

The French are as sensitive as eels to criticism. They resent criticism. Such an attitude is damaging and unrealistic. They are not free of blame. They waited too long before bringing genuine aid. Associate Justice William O. Douglas recently wrote an article which appeared in *Look* magazine. Therein he laid heavy strictures upon France vis-a-vis Morocco. He charges that "the French have fastened a milking machine on Morocco for their benefit." Yet in another breath he says:

The French have done good things in Morocco since they made it a protectorate in 1912. They have built fine communication systems—highway, railway, telephone, and telegraph. There are good French hotels and restaurants everywhere, and in the larger towns there are good French shops also. The French opened mines, built factories, cleared ground for large farming enterprises, and established new industries. They introduced public-health measures, eradicated malaria, and supplied the towns with pure water. They undertook a tree-conservation program that has produced good results; and they have done much to plant forests.

The judge, whom I consider my dear friend and for whom I have great respect, I believe has been misinformed and is enthusiastically misguided when he plumps for immediate Moroccan independence and disparages the French. His emphasis is strictly one-sided.

With a large but politically unschooled population badly divided within itself, Moroccans will be reaping a whirlwind of trouble with independence now. Meanwhile the French have the bear by the tail. I do not blame them for hesitating before pulling out now.

I quote from the New York Herald Tribune's editorial of October 19, 1954:

Thus, after acknowledging a very few of the achievements of the French protectorate since its establishment in 1912, the author [Justice Douglas] cites housing as an example of how these achievements have largely benefited a French milking machine. He is silent about French-financed modern housing projects for Moroccans like those in Casablanca and Rabat, and neglects the French effort to get Moroccans into schools above the level of the traditional Koranic institutions, making the extraordinary statement that "education is reserved for the French." He totally ignores the vast diversities and divided allegiances of Arab, Berber, and Jew, making it sound as though nearly every Moroccan wanted the French to leave tomorrow.

Justice Douglas also attributes to the ex-Sultan a degree of interest in Western parliamentary institutions that would astonish Ben Youssef's strongest partisans. In fact, last year's move to depose him, however wise or unwise it may have been, was made in large part because he had blocked French-sponsored reforms that would have paved the way for many of the changes Justice Douglas urges.

Americans rightfully and traditionally support self-determination and freedom. But self-determination must be tinted with commonsense. Immediate freedom for Morocco would mean not only anarchy but intense hostility toward the United States. Can we afford chaos and intense enmity in an area which contains five of our important long-range bomber bases? I doubt it. We must be on the side of the French.

ALGERIA

The French have been in Algeria for over 100 years. Algeria is a part of metropolitan France and is represented in the French National Assembly and its inhabitants are citizens of France, whereas Tunisia and Morocco are monarchies under French protection. Under the *Cremieux* decree of 1870, Jews have been citizens of France, and this includes the Algerian Jews. The protection of Jews in Algeria parallels the period during which France has been in possession. The French have had a protectorate over Morocco only since 1912, but they have been in Algeria since the early part of the 19th century, and in Tunisia since 1880. The longer the French have been in control the greater has been the security of the Jew. Many Jews occupy positions of public influence and authority. Numbers of them have been elected to the French National Assembly. The Jewish population numbers about 140,000 out of a total population of about 8 million.

The position of the Jews is strongest in Algeria and weakest in Morocco. There is little or no evidence of any independence movement in Algeria. There was a flare-up of *Fellaghas* or outlaws, who operate in the southern part of Algeria in the province of Constantine, as well as in the western part of Tunisia. They seek independence for Tunisia and Algeria. As far as Algeria is concerned, the movement is quite negative.

Most of the Jews live in Algiers and are happy and contented. A small number have gone to Israel. The Jews in Algeria have great faith in the French.

TUNISIA

Tunisia presents a different picture at present. There are about 110,000 Jews in Tunisia—most of them in Tunis—out of a total population of about 3½ million. The backbone of the independence movement in Tunisia is the Neodestour Party. The Bey of Tunisia, the nominal head of the protectorate under the French, is friendly to the Jews. Some Jews are members of the Neodestour Party. At the present time, the Neodestour Party is conducted honestly and decently. Publicly, the Jews are for it, but privately they express fear that at some future date, this party might become infiltrated with Moors who are oriented toward the Moslem Brotherhood and the Fellaghas. That is why many Jews in Tunisia would, if they could, go to Israel. Privately, they are much concerned with the promise made by Premier Mendes-France that independence will be given to Tunisia with the qualification that the French will control the common defense and conduct the foreign affairs of Tunisia. With the departure of the French soldiers and police, the Jews of Tunisia might eventually be in danger.

One prominent Jew may become a member of the Tunisian Cabinet.

It is my belief that Tunisia is ready for independence by virtue of its present state of literacy and democracy which exists there today.

In conclusion, the position of the Jews in Tunisia at present is salutary. The future is in doubt. No obstacle is placed against any Jew desiring to emigrate to Israel. Both the French and Tunisians desire them to remain to help build up the new economy. There is indeed very good hope that the problem of Tunisian independence will be solved by the wisdom and diplomacy of Mendes-France and the patience and prudence of the Tunisian leaders, including the Bey of Tunisia. I say this despite the efforts of the Arab League, which incessantly radios vicious propaganda from Cairo and drafts and arms insurgents from across the long and unguarded frontier from Libya.

Neither in Tunisia nor in Algeria does any representative of the Israeli Government encourage emigration to Israel.

The future will witness the emigration of many thousands of North African Jews to Israel, if such huge emigration will be possible. There is the question, of course, of the absorptive capacity of Israel. Can Israel take many more thousands of the swiftly breeding Jews of that area—that is without creating more arable land—particularly in the sanded wastes of the Negev?

LIBYA

It is interesting to note that it was the Israel vote in the United Nations which decided the independence of Libya. After independence, the Jews in Libya were persecuted. There are only about 2,500 Jews left there out of a Jewish population of 30,000. The Fellaghas, who back the operations against France in western Tunisia and southern Algeria, received their training in camps situated in Libya, and the Libyan Government gave them arms and uniforms.

Libya has permitted great discomfort if not persecution of its Jews. This despite Israel's vote for her independence. What poetic justice.

The Folly of Low Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 1, a bill designed to open the American market further to products made by cheap foreign labor.

Mr. Speaker, in order to maintain prosperity on our farms and in our factories and to maintain our standard of living, which is at once both the pride and the envy of the world, we must maintain reasonable tariffs to protect our industries and our workers from the competition of cheap foreign labor. I am as convinced of this as I am that to open our markets to a flood of low-cost foreign goods spells economic disaster to our Nation.

This deep-seated conviction of mine was not reached hastily. It is not the result of theoretical reasoning. Nor is it based on some nebulous economic hypothesis. It is the conclusion of experience.

If there were only one lesson which history had taught us since the founding of the Republic, it would be this—that tariff protection has brought us prosperity and that low tariffs have always left economic disaster in their wake.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider for a few moments the history of our Nation. Let us see how the raising and lowering of our tariffs over the years has had its impact on the economy and prosperity of the country. Let us listen with an attentive ear to what the great men of another generation, Democrat and Republican alike, have had to say concerning this historic issue.

After the war with England and the ratification of the treaty of Ghent, President Madison sent a special message to Congress in which he cautioned against destroying our commerce in the framing of a new tariff law. He urged consideration for our industrial enterprises, and had his Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander J. Dallas, make an estimate of what amount of reduction would be safe. He made it plain that the protective feature of our tariff system was to be cautiously preserved. Contrary to his recommendations, the duties contained in the new tariff law were low and the economic progress of the infant Republic was checked.

Let me offer the testimony of a great Democrat. In the third volume of his *History of the American Republic*, Woodrow Wilson says on this early phase of a low-tariff policy:

It was manifestly injurious to every young industry that a flood of English imports should continue to pour into the country

at the open ports. The remedy was a protective tariff.

Commenting on the results of the Tariff Act of 1816, Senator Tom H. Benton, of Missouri, a southern Democrat, declared:

No price for property, no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sale for the products of the farmer. Distress was the universal cry of the people.

In similar vein, Henry Clay had this to say:

If one desires to find the 7 years of greatest adversity in this country since the adoption of the Constitution, let him examine the 7 years before 1824.

Even Thomas Jefferson, living in retirement at Monticello, wrote to Silliam Simpson and spoke of the grave danger of tariff duties so low that British merchants could override them.

What was done following the period of distress caused by the low Tariff Act of 1816? In 1818, 1824, and 1828, protective measures were enacted. Industrial progress was so substantial that Daniel Webster surrendered his free-trade theories in the face of the overwhelming physical facts and was forever afterward a staunch protectionist. Moreover, Andrew Jackson also testified to the benefits derived from the higher duties under the act of 1824 in these words:

Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity unequalled perhaps in any portion of the world.

A compromise bill to pacify the free-trade element, the exporters of cotton, which act was introduced by Henry Clay, became law on March 2, 1833. What happened? Foreign commerce rode over these reduced duties and calamity followed; 1837 was the year of the first great American depression. Distress followed until duties were again advanced to the protection point.

This disaster caused by the compromise act, reducing duties on imports, was repaired by a tariff bill in 1842, which carried duties high enough to encourage American industries. Under this tariff act in the 4 years between 1842 and 1846, the country entirely recovered from the depression.

Let me call as a witness to the effect of the increase on duties under the Tariff Act of 1842, the Honorable John M. Berrin, United States Senator from Georgia. He declared:

The credit of the Government was prostrate and has been redeemed. The Treasury was empty, it is now replenished. The commerce and navigation of the country have increased. Its agricultural condition has improved.

Next came the election in 1844. The election of Polk called for reduction in import duties. As a result, the Democratic Congress reduced tariffs under the Tariff Act of 1846.

The country was prosperous when the so-called Walker tariff bill became a law. The evidence of this is recorded in President Polk's message to Congress in that same year, which reads as follows:

Abundance has crowned the toil of the husbandman, and labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward. * * * The

progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of our territorial limits and the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy conditions of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

Three physical events staved off the evil day of this low Tariff Act of 1846. The Mexican War, discovery of gold in California, and the Crimean struggle in Europe which involved Great Britain, France, Germany, and Turkey.

The day of doom to American industry, labor, and agriculture came when peace came.

When peace came to the Old World the vessels which had been employed in supplying strength for each battling nation were released and the importers' flag flew through our open ports. American markets were flooded with cheap wares from abroad, and the political sin of a low tariff brought its inevitable disaster.

As usual, the free traders, refusing to profit by past experience, closed their eyes and ears to facts and logic and instead of meeting the problem by protection, forced a further reduction in tariffs in 1857.

Let a Democrat describe what followed. President Buchanan in his message to Congress in 1858 said:

With all the elements of national wealth in abundance our manufacturers were suspended, our useful public enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want. Universal distress prevailed among the commercial manufacturing and mechanical classes.

A financial crisis swept the country. The depression of 1857 in many ways exceeded in violence that of 1837. After the low tariffs had been in operation for 3 years, President Buchanan, on December 4, 1860, said, regarding the widespread disaster:

Indeed all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

This indisputable evidence of the devastating result to the country under a low-tariff policy was recorded not only when President Buchanan went out of office in 1861; but also, to look ahead for a few years, when Grover Cleveland went out of office in 1897, and when Woodrow Wilson went out of office in 1921.

Horace Greeley has left his testimony as to one of these devastation periods in these words:

The 3 years of low duties, as in two former periods of relatively free trade, had been years of general depression, of numerous bankruptcies, of labor widely destitute of employment, of enormous and harassing commercial indebtedness abroad and of stagnation in improvements at home. Protection has proven beneficial to all the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but that during the 14 years prior to the Civil War when the party in power made no effort to safeguard enterprise of an industrial nature in this country, the fatal and unavoidable consequence was that few competitive mills or factories were built and labor and agriculture suffered.

This surrender to foreign influence and interest came to an end when the Morrill

Tariff Act of 1861 restored the American protective tariff policy. Industry and agriculture were immediately rejuvenated. Under the protective tariff the Nation had expanded tremendously, and, by 1872, was nearing the crest of a new era of prosperity. However, the country had still not learned the lesson of bitter experience. Again there was agitation for lower tariffs, and in the act of 1872 very substantial reductions were made. Again the Nation entered into a period of depression marked by the panic of 1873.

There was some upward adjustment of tariffs by the act of 1883, although, however, on the whole, no important changes were made until 1890.

In 1890 Congress passed the so-called McKinley tariff, intended to stimulate further development of agriculture and industry. The result was an average rate of duty of about 49 percent during the 3 fiscal years 1892-94. President Harrison said in December 1892, relative to the Nation's economic condition:

There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or wages were so high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their own power to supply the necessities and comforts of life.

When Grover Cleveland was returned to office in 1893, he immediately began to work for lower tariffs. Little wonder then that uncertainty and pessimism spread throughout the country, culminating in the financial panic of 1893. But still the lesson had not been learned. The freetraders remained blind to the teachings of history. President Cleveland epitomized this refusal to face the facts when he said:

With plenteous crops, with abundant promises of remuneration production and manufacture, with unusual invitations to safe investment and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distress and fear have sprung up on every side. * * * Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

The political campaign of 1896 was waged almost solely on the issue of free silver, but following the election of William McKinley as President, steps were immediately taken for returning our tariffs to protective standards. The Dingley Tariff Act, passed in 1897, provided a general increase in rates, and the country was quickly brought back to health, strength, and prosperity.

Following a split in the Republican Party, Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912, and once again the agitation for tariff reduction began. In 1913 the Underwood Tariff Act, adding many items to the free list, was enacted.

It is interesting in the light of the present low-tariff trade-agreement policy to listen to the prophecy made by Jonathan P. Dolliver during the debate on the Wilson measure. He said:

I, for one, am not discouraged even if Congress should enact this into law because I know that the people of the United States, having learned their lesson in the midst of broken fortunes and impoverished industries, will come back speedily to the historic standards of American commonsense.

Another prominent Democrat, commenting on the bill, said:

The disregard of experience, the closing of our eyes to truths chiseled on the walls of time, forever send us to the mourner's bench, sinners against political wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, it does, indeed, appear to have been our unhappy fate over the years—and apparently is still our fate today—to ignore those lessons of history for which we have paid so dearly.

The Democratic Party conducted a rebellion against reason and experience when it lowered the tariff rates in 1913. The country had been prosperous, but what were the consequences by the middle of 1914? Four million people walked the streets of America in idleness; industry was in distress; business lay prostrate; want had its foot inside the door of every home. It was a repetition of the same old free-trade tragedy.

Of course, the World War intervened and raised a wall of protection around the United States as high as the Embargo Act employed by Thomas Jefferson. War orders from Europe poured in like a torrent; imports declined; exports boomed. The day of reckoning was postponed.

However, the low Tariff Act of 1913 was on the statute books when war ceased. Let me quote from a Democrat as to what followed:

But after the World War was over, after the vessels of the Old World were released from their burdens to fly the shippers' flag, after Europe caught up in production and had something to sell, England with her surplus lying in warehouses, Australia with an abundance of wool, South America with cheap meats, and the Far East with vegetable oils, all turned to the land of gold, to America, and commenced dumping their wares upon our shores. * * * A situation was immediately brought about which beggars description—ruin ran riot from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coast.

And then he said:

This could not have happened with a protective policy in effect.

He refers to the situation of the cattlemen in these dramatic words:

Stockmen, rich and powerful one day, found themselves almost the next without credit and without equity in their vast herds roaming the broad prairies and thousands of hills. The work of years wasted, the earnings of the hazardous task of a midnight guard riding by running steers when the deadly lightning played upon their barns, were scattered in the winds of tariff heresy.

The cattle industry suffered in particular. Every cattleman knows that when the First World War was over the foreign accumulated supply of wool and beef came into our ports, overwhelmed the domestic markets, and one of the most flourishing industries of America was laid waste. That was under a low tariff bill. It was then that the Argentine began to send boat loads of frozen carcasses into New York and other American ports below the cost of production on the ranges of the Southwest. Also be it remembered that a cattle raiser of the Argentine can put his cattle upon the consuming markets of this country for less shipping rate than the producers of the South and West.

The negotiations for an Argentine trade agreement is temporarily suspended, but negotiations can be resumed. If it is, are the cattlemen of the United States again to be subjected to the same character of competition as they were under the tariff bill of 1913? It must not be forgotten that it was under the low tariff of 1913 that the cattlemen of Texas and New Mexico, and Arizona, and Wyoming, and other producing States saw their market glutted, paralyzed, and their credit destroyed in 1920.

The flood of imports which followed the war led to the Emergency Act of May 1921, which increased duties on agricultural commodities, and provided against unfair methods of competition, especially dumping. A qualified embargo was placed upon dyes and certain other chemicals. In 1922 the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was passed again providing protection to American industry. What did the Fordney-McCumber law do? It produced more revenue the first year of its operation than any tariff law that ever existed in this country. It opened up factories. It put 5 million idle men back on the payrolls of America. It made purchasers and consumers for the farmers.

The Fordney-McCumber law went into operation in September 1922. By the time it had been in operation 12 months the sheep and wool industry showed complete recovery and agricultural conditions in the South had made notable gains. The cotton and peanut producers of Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and the Carolinas were enjoying unparalleled prosperity. It was in May 1923, following the passage of this law that a commission of southern governors came to Washington and told President Harding that their States were doing well since a duty had been placed on vegetable oils and urged that the existing schedule be retained.

The postwar decade, 1920 to 1930, was one of great national prosperity and expansion. In 1930 the Smoot-Hawley Act was enacted containing a complete general tariff revision. Of course, the worldwide financial and economic depression had already commenced to spread to the United States from foreign areas by June 1930, when the act was passed. As a result, there is no statistical basis for estimating its effect upon the foreign commerce of this country since during the period 1930 to 1933 prices of practically all commodities in the world collapsed and international trade was completely disorganized.

From 1934 on the trade agreements authority has been in effect. During this period the country has been in the depths of depression or engaged in war or busy rebuilding the war-torn economies of the rest of the world. There is, thus, little basis for estimating the effect on the economy of the present tariff program. Of course, one of the most tragic aspects of our pre-World War II trade was our tremendous shipments of war materials to Japan. Millions of tons of scrap metals were shipped from the United States to Japan during that period. The free traders insisted at that time that

we were increasing the chances for peace by bolstering Japan's economy. On December 7, 1941, this folly was rewarded. Pearl Harbor was our first dividend on our investment in peace. Once again the lesson had to be learned—this time in the blood of American boys.

Mr. Speaker, once more we are approaching the fateful crossroad. The world is again in arms. The Soviet menace stretches from the banks of the Elbe to the shores of the Pacific. We are asked to delegate to the Executive even broader powers to lower our tariffs—once more in the name of peace and prosperity.

I wish to quote from a speech made by our beloved ex-President Herbert Hoover on his 80th birthday at West Branch, Iowa, the place of his birth. On this occasion Mr. Hoover, among other things, said:

In our foreign relations there are great dangers and also vital safeguards to freemen. During the last war we witnessed a special encroachment of the Executive upon the legislative branch. This has been through a new type of commitment of the United States to other nations. I am not going to argue legalisms—

Said Mr. Hoover—

for they do not go to the center of the issue. The real issue is in whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence, or by joint statement with foreign officials, can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people.

Continuing, Mr. Hoover said:

There has been a grievous list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market. But more terrible were such executive agreements as our recognition of Soviet Russia which opened the floodgates for a torrent of traitors. Our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia spread communism over the earth. Our acquiescence in the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States at Moscow and the partition of Poland at Tehran extinguished the liberties of tens of millions of people.

Worse still—

Said Mr. Hoover—

was the appeasement and surrender at Yalta of 10 nations to slavery. And there was the secret agreement with respect to China which set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all of China. These unrestrained Presidential actions have resulted in a shrinking of human freedom over the whole world.

From these actions came the jeopardies of the cold war. As a byproduct these actions have shrunk our freedoms by crushing taxes, huge defense costs, inflation, and compulsory military service.

We must make such misuse of power forever impossible. And let me say I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower, but he will not always be President.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have the greatest confidence in President Eisenhower and his use of such powers as are granted to him by Congress; but in the light of what has been done by other Presidents in the use of executive power without reference to the people's representatives, the fact must not be ignored that President Eisenhower will not always be our Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fine thing to be concerned for our friends abroad, to wish to raise their standards of living, to strengthen the economies of the rest of the world. But, Mr. Speaker, in so doing let us not forget the United States. Unless our own economy is strong and our own people prosperous, the free world will indeed be in a hopeless plight.

Mr. Speaker, let us learn the lessons of experience before it is forever too late.

Christmas, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, December 18, 1954:

It may seem a long way from the manger at Bethlehem to a New York penthouse high in the sky.

From a camel to a jet plane.

Across the distance of 1,954 years.

And yet the stars above seem the same.

While the life of a person who lives to be 80 is only a brief moment of awareness.

The world today is in fearful worship of atomic energy, the primitive pagan deference to a terrifying force that we have not learned to control, just as our so-called uncivilized ancestors made sacrifices to the powerful but vengeful gods of the sun and the sea.

Man, with all his proud, material accomplishments, faces the future with greater uncertainty than ever before.

For now his finger rests lightly but nervously on the trigger of a mechanism, the two-edged weapon that could sear his whole world with fire and leave the few survivors in prehistoric darkness.

Ignoring at this Christmas of 1954 the miracle that took place at Bethlehem over 19 centuries ago, the miracle of love that is always available to save him from his weakness and his cruelty, if he will only try to live his life as God intended that he should.

Christmas, 1954, with its message of peace on earth to men of good will is an inspiring religious festival.

That brings faith and hope and purification to hundreds of millions of people.

To others it is but the commercial climax of the year.

While heads of government search for answers to the unknown in the danger and the darkness beyond the neon-lighted streets, far off in the secret recesses of the brains that rule Moscow and Peking, and plot to master the world by force and fraud and terror in place of God's redeeming love, we in the United States can be thankful for many blessings on this Christmas of 1954.

That we live in freedom under governments responsible to us, the sovereign people. Without masters, or slaves.

With signs of progress all around us as America builds upward and outward. The only servants are machines, tens of millions of them, that we control most of the time. Motor cars and planes, a loved one speaking to us across a continent, and pictures coming to us through the air as science gives us the magic eye and ear to be present

at great events, no matter where they happen.

In laboratories, hospitals, and universities new miracles are unfolding to bring us health and happiness and greater understanding.

Everything quickens with life as express highways arch over our cities to expedite trade and travel, and people find the elbow-room for sunlit homes instead of dark tenements, in the countryside that is growing more ranch houses than crops.

And you think how wonderful it is to be 20 years of age and standing on the threshold of man's greatest progress.

Here in America, where all the machines and tools and techniques are banishing the poverty and the back-breaking toil, and the worry, that have stunted the growth of many.

We are thankful for the schools and churches of our land. For the good that people do, because they are free to develop the best within them without fear of Government reprisals. Freedom to think, and speak, and do, and pray.

With these liberating powers, we can eventually solve any problem—if we have enough time.

We Americans have weathered many storms—for independence, for unity, for progress, and survival.

We suffered hardship and despair, but our faith in what is right gave us the strength to surmount all difficulties.

Sometimes our leaders made tragic blunders. Sometimes we were late in waking up to the betrayers; to those who put money, power, and pride above all else; to the fanatics of the right and of the left.

In spite of these dangers, the good commonsense of the average American, his decency, and his regard for other people, managed to keep us on a steady course.

These are the gifts we have received from freedom under God, for which we are grateful at this Christmastide, as we commemorate the Birthday of our Saviour whose life on earth pointed the way to brotherhood and peace to men of good will.

Most of the world longs for peace and equality of opportunity, but a few evil men are not satisfied with this. In the name of the false god of communism, they would enslave mankind, stripping their fellow humans of mind and soul and dignity—to satisfy their consuming lust for power and to heal the sickness of their own insecurity.

We could be sorry for these tyrants because their desperate cruelty is a confession that they are lost and are trying to cut through the jungle of their own hates and fears.

We could be forgiving but for their present brutality and their continuing aggressions.

On December 10 Molotov declared before a rally of would-be conquerors—and I quote: "There is no force in the world strong enough to stop the march of communism."

Mr. Molotov is in error.

There are forces to crush the Communist assault upon humanity, if we had the determination to employ them effectively.

One is military: The use of our presently superior weapons to win a quick and decisive preventive war.

Another is economic: Aid to free nations that will enable them to develop a higher standard of living—and, by contrast, expose the failures of communism—similar to the progress of West Berlin as compared with the rundown condition of East Berlin, which is under Soviet control.

A third is moral: Reaching through to the captive peoples under the hammer and sickle, with the beliefs and the aspirations that we share in common, encouraging them to prepare for the day of their own liberation.

As to military means, time is the diminishing factor.

The United States, which has a clear superiority in nuclear weapons and the means of bringing them on target, did not unleash this overwhelming power against communism. Instead, it asked Russia and other nations to join in a workable plan, guaranteed by inspection and supervision, to outlaw nuclear weapons as a step toward disarmament and genuine world peace.

The Communists rejected this generous offer.

Why?

There can be only one answer.

Communist Russia is playing for time to assemble a sufficient supply of A-bombs and H-bombs, and long-range aircraft and guided missiles, that will force Europe and Asia to capitulate to its demands, thereby isolating the United States.

Our positions would be reversed.

The Nation would be at the mercy of the Communists, and no clear-thinking person could expect them to exercise the charity and forbearance that is guiding our foreign policy today as time, that is now on our side, is running out.

What should we do before it is too late?

The power advantage may be ours for 2 or 3 or possibly a few more years.

How are we going to use it in order to establish a foolproof peace?

By helping other nations to become materially strong and confident as a bulwark against communism.

By carrying psychological warfare to the Russian people, so that they will rise up to overthrow their despotic rulers?

By preventive war now to destroy the Communist regimes in Russia and China and replace them with governments representative of the Russian and Chinese peoples, who will cooperate with the United Nations to outlaw aggression forever?

This last is a hard alternative.

It may be the only one if the other alternatives do not show results, and soon.

Even preventive war is a choice that is limited by time.

Once Communist Russia catches up with us that chance is gone.

If anyone thinks that the Communists will change their design for world conquest if we will only be nice to them, or believes that we should just wait for a revolution by the oppressed peoples of Russia and China, then that person should consult a psychiatrist.

We will not survive without leadership and without a positive program to defeat communism.

Perhaps, as some suggest, we should serve an ultimatum upon the Communist tyrants through the United Nations while we still have the upper hand, establishing a deadline before which they must agree to a universal program of disarmament, made effective by U. N. inspection and control, or suffer atomic annihilation of their military and industrial centers.

Drastic? Yes.

But the need to establish and enforce an international system of law and order is imperative if the world is to escape enslavement or utter destruction, as time is running out for this as well as other alternatives.

How can we reach through to our fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain now to build a common cause that will forever outlaw aggression?

So many of these captive peoples treasure the meaning of Christmas, hoping for freedom as they pray before home altars, safe for the moment from the secret police.

Christmas, 1954, is but 1 week away.

When freedom and slaves ask for the greatest gift of all—the way to find peace with honor for all men of good will.

Keep Your Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1954, I had the pleasure and privilege of making the dedicatory address at the ceremony dedicating the Kansas National Guard Armory, at Ottawa, Kans., the future home of Headquarters Battery, 127th Field Artillery Battalion, Capt. Thomas E. Gleason, commanding.

As I began my remarks, which follow, jet planes, flown by Air National Guard men, roared over in salute:

If I were to give my remarks any title—I would call it "Keep Your Guard Up," for in this world of international conflict, just as in the fight ring, any relaxation in our defense might very well give any determined enemy the opening he has looked and waited for. Those jets which have just roared overhead are proof of the modernization of the National Guard.

To many, a small local unit of the National Guard may seem unimportant. If it were the only such unit it might be—but this battery is but one of thousands throughout the country—all of which put together makes up 27 divisions of ground troops, to which we can add 27 Air National Guard wings—a very vital and important part of our entire national defense.

The National Guard is not new—it is the successor to the old militia—the Minute Men of the Revolutionary War—and the advance made in those long historic years is made evident in this very unit.

Once we heard the phrase that we can "call a million men to arms overnight." If that ever was true, even in the day and age of the soldier armed with a musket, it certainly is far from true today.

For today, the National Guard man, as you have seen in the parade, is equipped with modern complex weapons, which require skill to operate—and skill to maintain; motor vehicles by the thousands, instead of foot travel or animal traction; radio and other complex communications equipment, instead of the simple semaphore flags; complex electronic computers, instead of pencil and pad of paper; radar detection, instead of far-flung outposts, or clumsy observation balloons.

All of these new weapons, not to mention automatic hand weapons, recoilless artillery and so many other items including the Honest John rocket and NIKE antiaircraft installations require time to master their effective operation; they require adequate efficient classrooms, such as you'll find here.

Too much credit cannot be given these citizen soldiers of the National Guard, who give up their time from pleasures and families during the week, and their vacations in summer—all that this Nation may be secure. No one knows when again our Guard units will be called into Federal Service. Maybe tomorrow—maybe not till next year, 10 years from now; perhaps never. But whenever it is they will again perform their services as they have in the past.

In World War I, over one-quarter of the troops in combat in Europe were National Guard troops—including the 35th Division from Kansas and Missouri, in which I served as a private first class.

World War II saw 9 National Guard units in Europe, again the 35th was there, and 9 units in the Pacific. All of these turned in magnificent records of combat.

From the ranks of the National Guard came officers and noncommissioned officers to train new troops.

In fact, the contribution of the National Guard in both those wars was so great that one shudders to think what might have happened to our country without them ready to answer the call of their country.

Again, Korea made the need of National Guard units quite apparent.

With all of our Regular troops withdrawn from this country—National Guard troops were ready to defend the continental United States, if needed, just as they have always been, and now are ready to do.

Citizens of Ottawa can well be proud of their national guardsmen—and proud of themselves for the part they have played in making the new fine armory available—not only for training of this local unit, but available for community affairs of many kinds.

Looking at it from a selfish angle, you have made a good investment, not only in having well-trained military men in your midst, but from a financial angle as well. Every 3 months new money in the form of drill pay comes into town—and it turns over 7 times, which here in Ottawa means new business. It means greater national security, upon which the security of each individual depends.

So, I join with you in the joy you have in dedicating this building to the services of our State and Nation, to be used for the training of the youth of your community for service in time of peace—or war. Young men, who I am sure, will—in the future, as their fathers in the past—serve with loyalty, courage, and skill—serving in such a fine manner that they, and you, will have great pride in them and their exploits.

Though they will be prepared, and better prepared, with these facilities, than they would have been otherwise, let us hope—yes—let us fervently pray—that they need never be called upon to serve in time of war.

In conclusion, as a part of this dedication ceremony, I wish to present to Captain Gleason, battery commander, a United States flag, which, at my request, was recently flown over the United States Capitol.

This flag, no different from any other, is more than mere threads of red, white, and blue. In its folds are contained all of the past and future of this great Nation.

And, as Francis Scott Key said, in those closing words of our national anthem—
“Long may it wave o’er the land of the free and the home of the brave.”

And it will wave long, because this is the land of the free and the home of the brave. Free because our men are brave. Brave because they have faith. Faith in themselves. Faith in their country. Faith in its future.

And above all because they have an abiding faith in God—the divine providence that has guided and guarded our beloved Republic.

Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the banquet of the New England Regional Tax Conference of

Public Accountants, December 10, 1954, Hotel Bradford, Boston, Mass.:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Uppermost in the minds of our people, and of countless millions of others throughout the world, is the desire for permanent peace—for a world of peace. It is only a small group of evil-minded men, through their domination of countries and of peoples, who prevent world peace of a lasting nature being established.

The world of today is confronted with a condition and not a theory.

You and I know that the evil forces of atheistic communism are bent on conquering the world and subjecting all peoples to communist enslavement, persecution, and even, death.

We must face the fact that we are dealing with a cold, ruthless, destructive force, the leaders of which are possessed of the minds of what might well be termed “world killers.”

If we permit ourselves to be deceived, or to become complacent, or disunited, or frustrated, it might prove dangerous to us. It is therefore imperative that we think calmly, rationally, and soundly, and in order to do so, the American people should be given all information possible.

The American people, when told the facts, are willing to make any sacrifice necessary for the best interests of our country. And our people should be given as much information as possible so that they may understand, and may be able to evaluate the situation, and form a sound, healthy, public opinion. For in a democracy, public opinion is the most necessary, pertinent, and powerful factor.

Under dictatorships, public opinion is suppressed and unable to assert itself because of fear.

And our people should be informed so that a sound, rational public opinion might be developed.

The withholding from our people of information that could and should be released tends to create uncertainty, confusion, frustration, fear, and disunity—and that is an unhealthy condition to have existing, and should be avoided.

For example, we read a great deal about peaceful coexistence. We all subscribe to that in principle. We would like to see it accomplished in fact—not only peaceful coexistence but peace of a lasting nature.

But what do you and I know, even to the slightest extent, about this new policy which could easily lead to appeasement, and how it can be brought about?

What does peaceful coexistence mean to the Kremlin?

Can peaceful coexistence, whatever it means in fact and in results, be accomplished unless the Communist leaders change their minds and their intent to ultimately conquer the world? Does peaceful coexistence to the Kremlin mean submission to them and their ideology, which would result in slavery, persecution, and death? Does peaceful coexistence mean that the hopes of the people of Poland, of Lithuania, and other Communist-dominated countries to regain their independence and liberty are to be destroyed and these countries permanently frozen into the Soviet Union?

These, and many other questions, are involved and should be discussed publicly, and should be considered seriously by the Congress of the United States in order that the facts and the truth can be ascertained so that a sound public opinion can be developed in favor or against this policy before our country becomes committed to it.

I am talking about facts and information that can and should be made known to our people.

For unnecessary secrecy could be a dangerous road for a country like ours to travel.

And let me ask you what I consider to be a pertinent and proper question. Can peace-

ful coexistence be accomplished if the Communist leaders are still bent on world aggression? The answer to that question seems to me to be emphatically “No.”

The evidence clearly shows that aggression is still the Communist policy; that while their strategy might temporarily change, their intent of world domination has not; that the Communists are using the slogan of peaceful coexistence as another deceptive move in their efforts to divide and conquer.

It was only a few days ago on November 23, that the President in a press conference said that while “The Russians have lately been talking a different tone than they had for sometime past” and that “there was one underlying, unchanging motive, world revolution and the dominance of a Communist centrally controlled world state.”

And on November 11, while appearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Secretary Dulles said, in relation to the aggressive intent of Red China, and I quote, “That Communist China is showing aggressive intent in Asia which belies its protestations of peace.”

On the same day that the President, talking in Boston, said in substance that “Peace was nearer now than it has been for many years.” And at the same gathering, Ambassador Lodge said that the “U. N. is succeeding despite unending Soviet attempts to sabotage it.”

It is difficult for me to reconcile these statements. It is difficult for me to believe that peaceful coexistence can be brought about with the Kremlin still determined to conquer the world; with its ally and present junior partner, Red China, persecuting and imprisoning American airmen; shouting defiance to the dignity and honor of our country and making preparations for another shooting conflict.

For once committed to a policy, we must follow it through.

It therefore seems to me that before our country is committed to this policy, we should view it and all of its implications with extreme caution having in mind always the national interests of the United States of America.

One of the main purposes of diplomacy, where differences exist between countries, is to try and reduce as much as possible the area of differences. That is a wise policy for diplomats to follow.

However, this involves good faith on the part of both sides to try to solve or reduce the area of differences.

It is most difficult for me to believe that any real progress can be made where bad faith exists on the part of one of the negotiating countries.

And mark you, I am discussing a major matter—not a minor one—of concern to our people.

We have traveled from the policy of liberation and of massive and instant retaliation to that of impending peaceful coexistence.

We had better stop, look, and listen and thoroughly inquire and deliberate before we become committed to this policy, where the results of a mistake or a wrong guess is a picture that I would not want to paint.

I think that the old saying, “eternal vigilance is the price of liberty” would be a better one for us to follow. Whether we like it or not, whether we want to or not, we must face the fact that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military force and power greater than they possess.

The Communists do not fear God, because they do not love Him. In fact, they hate Him and are fighting God and His natural law on earth. Their god is materialism and power, carrying with it the imposition of their vicious ideology, and in its wake, imperialism, slavery, persecution, and death.

But even Communists, despite the fact that they attempt to deny it, are subject to the law of self-preservation, just the same

as is any other person. And in the hidden resources of their minds, the Communist leaders know that the law of self-preservation applies to a nation just as well as it does to an individual.

And the one thing that they will respect, because of fear—fear of defeat and destruction—is military power and strength greater than they possess.

And in relation to our diplomats dealing with the diplomats of such a force and movement, the Soviet Union, the weapon that will enable us to carry out our national objectives in the field of foreign affairs is the strength and power of our military force. And the strength and power of our military force must be in relation to the strength and power of the Soviet Union and its satellites and dominated nations.

For if we are stronger, respect through fear will exist, with favorable results.

If we are weaker, arrogance and contempt will exist with other results.

There is no question but that we possess strong military strength and power—in our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force. There is no question of the genius of our scientists, our engineers, our businessmen, our workers, our members of our Armed Forces, particularly in their specialized training, of our people as a whole, and of our will and determination to remain a free people.

But the principal question is not whether we are militarily strong—but is our overall military strength and power greater than that of the potential enemy? Is it such as to command respect through fear so as to deter attack and prevent another general conflict and to make a contribution toward ultimate world peace?

There are many among us, military men, Members of Congress, and among our people who feel that we should be stronger, having in mind the military strength possessed by the forces of world revolution and aggression.

In order to determine if our military strength and power in relation to that possessed by the Soviet Union is powerful enough to instill respect through fear, there must be not only an understanding of our own strength but of the strength of the Soviet bloc.

While it is difficult to obtain definite information, there is enough reliable information available to give us a current appraisal of the Soviet strength. It is known that from 1947 to the present time the numerical strength of the Soviet ground forces of 175 divisions has remained fairly constant. Nevertheless, significant changes have been made in favor of increased mechanization with sturdy and efficient modern equipment. It is reliably understood that 65 divisions of their present establishment are tank and mechanized divisions, that rifle divisions have been provided motorized equipment, and that they also have organic tanks and additional artillery. This means that the mobile and fire power have been increased through the introduction of improved weapons and equipment.

The Soviet Union, Eastern Germany, and Eastern European satellites today have over 6 million men under arms. Approximately 4,500,000 of these are in ground forces, with a high state of preparedness maintained as a result of a rigorous training program. It is known that the number of satellite divisions have almost doubled since 1947, bringing their total to at least 80 divisions.

The Soviet Union has a readymade spearhead for a rapid advance into Western Europe, if that decision is ever made. This spearhead is composed of at least 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany. The bulk of these are armored divisions with nearly a complete complement of tanks and self-propelled guns—and behind this spearhead, there are additional 60 Soviet divisions located in the Eastern European satellite countries and in western Russia. This does not take into account satellite country divisions.

It is also known that their mobilization system is exercised periodically to insure its effectiveness by the ability of the Soviet and satellite ground forces to quickly increase to 400 divisions.

The numerical strength of the Soviet air force in recent years has been constant, having been stabilized at about 20,000 aircraft, but the rapid increase in Soviet air potential is shown by the rate of changeover to jet aircraft. For example, in 1951, about 20 percent of their fighters were jet types. By the year 1954, almost all of their fighters were jet types.

In connection with the light bombers, a similar development has occurred.

For example, in early 1951, jet bombers had not been introduced by the Soviet into operational units. By 1954, well over two-thirds of their light bomber force were jets.

In the medium bomber category, the TU-4's, which are similar to the United States B-29, the Soviets have doubled the number of this type in operational units since 1951, and still newer types of medium bombers, including jet models also have been observed.

The development of a comprehensive aviation training program, according to information received, has been one of the most significant contributions in Soviet postwar program to improve the capability of its air power.

The program for airfield construction has been and still is in progress with attention in recent years being directed to the construction of fields with very long runways. In the past 4 years, the Soviets have almost tripled the number of major airfields in eastern Europe that will accommodate jet fighters.

It is known that the combat value of the satellite air forces has increased significantly since 1951. In 1951, their aircraft was obsolete. By 1954, the numerical strength of satellite air forces had been doubled with one-half by jet fighters, with their facilities improved and the training, from a military angle, having reached a fairly satisfactory standard.

The Soviets have attached great importance to providing an effective air defense belt along the western perimeter of Russia through the construction of airfields throughout eastern Europe, and of aircraft control, warning systems, and antiaircraft artillery.

They have also since the end of World War II, improved their potential for the use of airborne troops and weapons.

From a naval angle, the information available is most striking. Their principal naval threat is the submarine capability. They are building other types of naval vessels at the same time. It is known that the Soviet Navy has over 300 submarines in service, and that about one-half of them are large or medium oceangoing types, and that the current large-scale naval construction program lays emphasis on the continued production of large oceangoing submarines.

It is known that the Soviet bloc has developed a strong capability in the special fields of atomic, chemical, and biological warfare, as well as in the field of guided missiles. The stockpile of the Soviets is of such a tremendous size, that they have more than enough tanks, mortars, and antitank guns for some three-hundred-odd Soviet divisions, with a stockpile of sea mines, field artillery, and antiaircraft artillery that is amazingly large, with the annual production of these items continuing at a sizable rate.

These facts have been made public at one time or another, but I am giving them to you in collected form because I feel that it is information that should be given to our people. It is information clearly showing the military strength and power of the Soviet and its satellites. And I might add that this does not include Red China.

If our people are made aware and awakened, I know that a sound public opinion will

be developed as a result of which steps in connection with the increasing of our military strength and power will be taken.

You will remember, that our policy of a few years ago was the building of an Air Force to 143 air-wing groups by latter 1955. That policy was scrapped in 1953 by reducing our objective to 120 air wing groups. This reduction was fought in Congress, and I was one of the Members who opposed it. But the reduction took place. Many outstanding military leaders opposed it as unwise, as a sign of weakness, and as too great a calculated risk to take for budgetary reasons.

Fortunately, a year later, the present administration changed its policy in this respect, and recommended appropriations to increase our Air Force to 137 air-wing groups by the middle of 1957. In doing this, however, for budgetary reasons, our Army has taken a sharp reduction during this fiscal year from 20 divisions to 17 divisions. A second year reduction had been ordered, but has, fortunately, been canceled.

There were a number of Members of Congress who expressed deep concern in this reduction, having in mind the known military strength and power of the Soviet bloc and their sinister purposes. We felt it was too great a calculated risk to take. Able military leaders also expressed their concern.

There was also a reduction in our Navy during this fiscal year. That is now taking place.

There is no question but that we have the advantage today in the possession of destructive bombs and other weapons of destruction and in our ability to produce them, as well as an advantage in the means of delivering them, if necessary, to determined targets. But the information available shows that the Soviet Union is narrowing down the advantage we possess in this field of offensive military action.

I am sure that you were amazed not so long ago to read in the newspapers that 90 to 95 percent of attacking planes from abroad could get through to their targets in the United States. In other words, the defense of our cities and our people from air attack was so weak that only from 5 to 10 percent of attacking planes, carrying their terrible instruments of destruction, would probably be intercepted and shot down.

This was information that not only amazed me but stunned me.

I am glad to advise you that as a result of speeches made in Congress, and I have made several of them, appropriations have been made to improve this situation. But we have a long way yet to go, and we should move faster.

While it is known that no defense can be built that will prevent any plane from getting to a target, it is known too that we can build defenses against air attack that would be reasonably certain of destroying anywhere from 40 to 50 percent of attacking planes. If such defenses were built, it is felt by competent authority that the "kill" to attacking forces would be so great that they would think and hesitate long before attacking.

It would seem to me to be of imperative importance that the most effective continental defense should be constructed as rapidly as possible. However, I repeat, that decided improvements have been made in this respect during the past year.

If we err, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

It is better for us to have too much military strength and power and not need it than to have too little and need it.

As long as the Kremlin adheres to its policy of world revolution and enslavement, the most effective way, as I see it, to stop Communist aggression, to deter war, and to ultimately bring about peace is through strength.

And I close my remarks with the statement that I have already made, and which

I have made in and out of the Congress on a number of occasions, and which, as an American, I shall continue to make because I consider it my duty to do so, that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military power and strength greater than they possess.

And with such a force, with the spiritual values of America, with public opinion when aroused, and a united America, we can approach the trying days that lie ahead with confidence and success.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the month of December I headed a group committee representing the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which had an audience with the Bureau of the Budget, in Washington, regarding the civil functions at the coming session of Congress. This group included representatives from the States of California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Iowa, and the District of Columbia, and they undertook to state the case for flood control and rivers and harbors work to the Bureau of Budget for every section of the Nation. Following this, the

National Rivers and Harbors Congress sent out to its members a newsletter, a copy of which is presented for inclusion in my remarks. I think this matter is an extremely important one and will be of interest to every Member of the Congress. The newsletter is as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C., December 27, 1954.

To the Members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

During the course of the current month, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress took strong action to help build up the budget recommendations for civil functions in the coming session of Congress. President OVERTON BROOKS led a strong committee from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which called up the Budget Bureau and talked to its officials for over an hour. On this committee were representatives from the States of California, Florida, Maryland, Louisiana, Idaho, and the District of Columbia; and the committee therefore spoke for the entire country.

We pointed out to the Bureau of Budget that for the last 4 years budget recommendations for rivers, harbors, and flood control work had been steadily falling in the face of further inflation which constantly lessened the purchasing power of the dollar. We further pointed out that the needs of the country have been steadily increasing with our growing population and that the pressure due to long delay in starting projects had been steadily increasing. We showed that this was the case although our national policy had been to pour billions of dollars into foreign aid, neglecting or postponing the development of internal improvement in our own Nation.

Your committee recommended to the Bureau of Budget three important policies, namely:

1. A larger yearly budget for civil functions until this recommended budget shall reach the figure of \$650 million per year.

2. A policy of recommending new starts in order that many projects approved for years may be given the green light.

3. The build-up of a backlog of new projects badly needed by this country in the rapid development of our internal resources. In other words, waterway development should keep pace with road, highway, and airway development.

Officials of the Bureau of Budget to whom we talked made no comment regarding the backlog. In reference to the first suggestion, namely, an increased overall budget, these officials indicated that some relief could be expected in recommendations made year after next to the Congress. During that year, some of the very large multiple-purpose dams will be completed and funds will then be available.

Mr. Carl H. Schwartz, Chief, Resources and Civil Works Division, made the statement in reference to the second suggestion that consideration was being given to "new starts" to be recommended to Congress for approval for the coming fiscal year; and that information regarding this matter would be released to the public during the early part of 1955. While we did not get all that we wanted, I feel that our committee accomplished a very useful mission on behalf of our membership and as your president, I am passing this information on to you.

Yours for a happy and prosperous New Year,

Cordially yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
President.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou companion of the pilgrim years, as with renewed powers and with restored souls, Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs face the high tasks of this National Chamber of deliberation, help them in all things, we pray, to be masters of themselves that they may indeed be the servants of others.

With the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. Be Thou the guardian and guide of the unbeaten way our feet must take. Above all, give us a consuming passion, not to have our own way, but to find Thy holy will. May no cherished resentment, no camouflaged selfishness, no small loyalties nor ingrained prejudices, choke and clog the channels of our national service. Enlarge our spirits to meet the stupendous dimensions of these epic days. O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1955, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Mr. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to recommendations for further developing the foreign economic policy of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 62)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to activities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which was read

and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to a report on trade agreement escape clauses, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, together with a report of the "on-farm" assistance through direct act to rehabilitate farm land damaged by disastrous floods, and a report of the operations under the emergency wind erosion control program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.